

THE ORIGINS AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE *MAHĀRATNAKŪṬA*
TRADITION OF MAHĀYĀNA BUDDHISM
WITH A STUDY OF THE *RATNARĀŚISŪTRA* AND RELATED MATERIALS

Volume I

by

Jonathan Alan Silk

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Asian Languages and Cultures: Buddhist Studies)
in The University of Michigan
1994

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Luis Oscar Gómez. Chair
Professor Madhav M. Deshpande
Assistant Professor T. Griffith Foulk
Professor Donald Lopez
Professor Gregory Schopen, The University of Texas

©Jonathan Alan Silk 1994
All Rights Reserved

For my Mother and Father
Without Whom There Would Be Nothing

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The list of those to whom I am indebted, academically and intellectually, is long. I cannot hope to thank them all here. But a few acknowledgments of those to whom I am most directly grateful with regard to the present project should not be out of order.

My greatest debt is no doubt to my ~~most direct~~ teachers, NAGAO Gadjin 長尾雅人 in Japan and Luis O. GOMEZ in the United States. Without the guidance of these great scholars it is doubtful that I would have ever reached the point of being able to write such a work as this. I think they have taught me well, and I am further grateful that, on the whole, they have let me go my own way. To Gregory SCHOPEN I owe innumerable suggestions about avenues of inquiry, works to which reference might be made, and not least of all perhaps something (although certainly not everything) of my cynical and questioning attitude toward the Buddhist tradition and what is “known” about it. I also owe to him the happy suggestion that I take up the *Ratnarāṣi* as a subject of study. His suggestion has borne even perhaps more fruit than he imagined. It should not go unnoticed that I also deeply appreciate his friendship — that above all.

I am also very grateful to the other members of my dissertation committee, Madhav DESHPANDE, Don LOPEZ and Griff FOULK. Professor DESHPANDE has been my guide in Sanskrit studies for many years, and is always a keen critic of my understanding of Indic texts and Indian culture. My long friendship with Griff FOULK has made us perhaps more comrades than teacher and student, and my debts to him in all aspects of my intellectual, not to mention personal, growth cannot be enumerated. My acquaintance with Professor LOPEZ has been of shorter duration, but am grateful for his helpful and

constructive comments on my work.

I began this work while at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, and am happy that I was able to encounter there William BAXTER III, the late Robert BROWER, Sandy HUNTINGTON, Yuet Keung LO, Robert SHARF, and Alexander VESEY. All of them have, in one way or another, changed the way I see things, and I am grateful to them all. Much of my time at Michigan was supported by Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships, for which I am grateful to the American Taxpayer.

I was very lucky to be able to get a series of grants which enable me to go to Japan in 1990, and remain there for almost four years. For this I am indebted to the Fulbright Foundation for a Doctoral Research Fellowship, to the Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai for a Fellowship which enabled another year of work, and finally to Ryūkoku University, for the generosity of their Numata Fellowship which enabled a year's stay. During my time in Kyoto Professor MIMAKI Katsumi 御牧克己 was kind enough to admit me as a visiting researcher under his guidance at Kyoto University, and I cannot thank him enough for that kindness, and for his permission to attend his classes. After my time at Kyoto University was finished, thanks to the kindness and generosity of Professors INAGAKI Hisao 稲垣久雄 and YAMADA Meiji 山田明爾 I was able to study at Ryūkoku University for one year. While at Kyoto University I was helped much by Professors KOBAYASHI Nobuhiko 小林信彦 and NAKATANI Hideaki 中谷英明, both of whom kindly allowed me to join their classes, and by Professor YANO Michio 矢野道雄. I am also beholden greatly to my fellow students KURIHARA Shōdō 栗原尚道, NODA Toshiko 野田智子, OTOKAWA Bun'ei 乙川文英, SUGITA Mizue 杉田瑞枝, and TOMABECHI Tōru 苦米地等流, all of whom gave me the their friendship and valuable advice. Although I have never studied with him formally, Professor ICHIGŌ Masamichi 一郷正道 has for years been and continues to be a good friend and advisor.

During the first two years of my stay in Japan it was my great good fortune to be

able to share a spacious and elegant old house with my good friend and fellow specialist in Indian Buddhism HIRAOKA Satoshi 平岡聡. My gratitude and debt to him goes far beyond words; I doubt anyone could have a better, more honorable friend. As a lecturer at Bukkyō University he also introduced me to many scholars there, among whom I must mention Professors KAJIYAMA Yuichi 梶山雄一, ONODA Shunzō 小野田俊蔵, KAGAWA Takao 香川孝雄, and NAMIKAWA Takayoshi 並川孝儀.

It was also a very lucky circumstance that we were able to arrange a small discussion group in Kyoto, christened by one of the members the “Early Mahāyāna Research Study Group.” The participants in this group, other than myself, were HIRAOKA Satoshi, Hubert DURT, HONJO Yoshifumi 本庄良文, SASAKI Shizuka 佐々木閑, and YAMAGIWA Nobuyuki 山極伸之. All of these friends have contributed greatly to my understanding and developing ideas concerning Mahāyāna Buddhism, but I would like to point out especially the assistance I have received from my good friend SASAKI Shizuka. Professor DURT has been always generous with his friendship and advice, and also in opening the Hōbōgirin Institute to me.

It was also during my time in Japan that I was able to meet and develop friendships with Urs APP, Wendi ADAMEK, ARAMAKI Noritoshi 荒牧典俊, Catherine CORNILLE, Robert DUQUENNE, ENOMOTO Fumio 榎本文雄, Antonino FORTE, FUJIEDA Akira 藤枝晃, Franco GATTI, Paul HARRISON, IRISAWA Takashi 入澤崇, David JACKSON, KATSURA Shōryū 桂紹隆, KUDARA Kōgi 百濟康義, MATSUDA Kazunobu 松田和信, Marek MEJOR, MOCHIZUKI Ryōko 望月良晃, NŌNIN Masaaki 能仁正顕, OCHIAI Toshinori 落合俊典, ODANI Nobuchiyo 小谷信千代, SHIRASAKI Kenjō 白崎顕成, WATANABE Shōgo 渡辺章悟, YAMAZAKI Gen'ichi 山崎元一, and YUYAMA Akira 湯山明, all of whom have in different but important ways contributed to my intellectual and personal growth. I should append a special note of thanks to Professor FORTE for his constant friendship and encouragement, and also for his generosity in making available the resources and space of his

research institute in Kyoto, the Italian School of East Asian Studies, and to Paul HARRISON for his support and many illuminating discussions about the Mahāyāna, not to mention other less august subjects. Paul and I also developed together a healthy respect for hot saké, a lesson which I will remember (more or less) for a long time.

Without the warmth and hospitality shown me by SHIMODA Mitsuko 下田美津子 and TANAKA Kōji 田中耕司, and SHIBATA Yumiko 柴田由美子, my life in Kyoto would have been much darker. They are good and life-long friends.

Although I have never met Helmut EIMER, Bhikkhu PĀSĀDIKA, or Peter SKILLING, I am nevertheless grateful for their advice and friendship, shared with me at a distance. On the same continent, but still far away, are my friends Collett COX, Leonard van der KUIJP, Jan NATTIER, and YAMABE Nobuyoshi 山部能宜.

I am sure that there are those whom I am overlooking, in the rush to finish up this thesis and submit it under the deadline, and I beg their indulgence. I had looked forward to the opportunity to write these acknowledgments in the expectation that they would provide me the opportunity to express in thoughtful and crafted words the depth and extent of my debt to my many friends and mentors. Instead, I find myself rushing to type these words with one eye on the clock. That the subsequent result is not eloquent should not be taken as a reflection of the feelings I hold for all those to whom I am beholden, for making me who I am.

Finally, I cannot end this without a word or two about my best friend, partner, wife, and all else, Yoko. I have dedicated this thesis to my parents, without whom I have said, there would be nothing. In the same vein, without Yoko, there will be nothing to come. With her, there can be everything.

PREFACE

The present study is the partial result of a larger experiment. I set out to study Mahāyāna Buddhism in general, and the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection in particular, but ended up focussed only on one small corner of the whole. One result of this is that there may be a certain lack of coherence from one part of the work to another. Parts of the present work may be technical in the extreme, and may even appear to lose the stream of the overall argument. This is not part of a plan, but rather an accident of the phase through which my current research has been completed; my results are partial, and overwhelmingly consist in uncontextualized details. I plan to continue this work in the future, and will make an effort to understand the broader context within which these details might fit. The present work is only a beginning.

Pāli texts are quoted in the editions of the Pāli Text Society. Unless otherwise noted, Jaina texts are quoted in the editions of the Jaina-Āgama-Series. Chinese materials, unless otherwise stated, are quoted according to the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*.

In quoting Tibetan materials I have at different times over the period during which my research was carried out had access to different versions of the Tibetan Kanjur and Tanjur. For the *Ratnakūṭa* section itself I have had constant access only to the Peking and sTog editions. For other sections I have occasionally had access to the Peking and Derge editions. I regret the lack of standardization in my citations, but it is a circumstance forced on me by a peripatetic research career, and uneven library resources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
PREFACE.....	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x

SECTION I

Chapter 1: Old Wine in New Bottles.....	1
Chapter 2: Kāśyapa and Maitreya	52
Chapter 3: Rags are Riches	69
Chapter 4: Perfect and Imperfect: Past, Present and Future	97
Chapter 5: The Merit of the Monk.....	182
Chapter 6: Supervision	215
Chapter 7: Final Notes.....	255

SECTION II

The English Translation	256
-------------------------------	-----

SECTION III

The Tibetan Text.....	386
-----------------------	-----

SECTION IV

The Chinese Edition	550
APPENDIX: The Texts of the <i>Ratnarāśi</i> and Related Materials.....	636
BIBLIOGRAPHY	707

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A	<i>Aṭṭhakathā</i> (when added to the abbreviation of a Pāli text).
AK(B)	<i>Abhidharmakośa(bhāṣya)</i> .
AN	<i>Aṅguttara Nikāya</i> .
Aṣṭa	<i>Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā</i> . Wogihara 1932-35.
Av	<i>Avadānaśataka</i> . Speyer 1906-09.
Bbh	<i>Bodhisattvabhūmi</i> . Wogihara 1936.
BCAP	<i>Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā</i> . La Vallée Poussin 1901-14.
BHSD	<i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary</i> . Edgerton 1953.
BHSG	<i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar</i> . Edgerton 1953.
CPD	<i>A Critical Pāli Dictionary</i> . Trenckner et al. 1924-.
CPS	<i>Catuspariṣad-sūtra</i> . Waldschmidt 1952-62.
Cy	Commentary.
Dbh	<i>Daśabhūmikasūtra</i> . Kondo 1936.
Dhp.	<i>Dhammapada</i> . Mizuno 1981.
Divy.	<i>Divyāvadāna</i> . Cowell and Neil 1886.
DN	<i>Dīgha Nikāya</i> .
GDhp	<i>Gāndhārī Dharmapada</i> . Brough 1962.
Gv.	<i>Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra</i> . Suzuki and Idzumi 1949.
Jāt.	<i>Jātaka</i> . Cowell et al. 1895-1907.
KN	Kern and Nanjio 1908-12.
KP	<i>Kāśyapaparivarta</i> . Staël-Holstein 1926.
LSV	Larger <i>Sukhāvatīvyūha</i> . Kagawa 1984.
LV	<i>Lalitavistara</i> . Lefmann 1902-08.
MBh	<i>Mahābhārata</i> .
Mhy.	<i>Mahāvvyūtpatti</i> . Sakaki 1916 and Ishihara and Fukuda 1989.
MN	<i>Majjhima Nikāya</i> .
MRK	<i>Mahāratnakūṭa</i> Collection.
Mv.	<i>Mahāvastu</i> . Senart 1882-97.
MW	Monier Williams 1899.

Pras.	<i>Pratyutpanna-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-sūtra</i> . Harrison 1978.
PTC	<i>Pāli Tipiṭaka Concordance</i> . Woodward et al. 1956-.
PtDhp	<i>Patna Dharmapada</i> . Cone 1989.
PTSD	<i>Pāli Text Society Dictionary</i> . Rhys Davids and Stede 1921-25.
RGV	<i>Ratnagotravibhāga</i> . Johnston 1950.
RP	<i>Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā</i> . Finot 1901.
Śikṣ.	<i>Śikṣāsamuccaya</i> . Bendall 1897-1902.
Sn.	<i>Sutta-nipāta</i> . Andersen and Smith 1913.
SN	<i>Samyutta Nikāya</i> .
SP	<i>Saddharmapuṇḍarīka</i> . References to KN when not otherwise stated.
SuvPr.	<i>Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra</i> . Nobel 1937, 1944.
T.	<i>Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō</i> 大正新修大藏經
Thag	<i>Theragāthā</i> . Oldenberg and Pischel 1883.
Thig	<i>Therīgāthā</i> . Oldenberg and Pischel 1883.
<i>Traité</i>	Lamotte 1944-80.
Uv.	<i>Udānavarga</i> . Bernhard 1965.
Vin.	<i>Vinaya</i> . Oldenberg 1879-83.
VKN	<i>Vimalakīrtinirdeśa</i> . Ōshika 1970.

SECTION I

Chapter 1

Old Wine in New Bottles

As all of Gaul was divided into three parts, so all of Buddhism has frequently been divided into two: Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. But while we know more or less what it means for there to have been three parts to Gaul, we are much less clear about the divisions imposed on the Buddhist tradition. What realities lie behind the two terms, Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna? Or, to cast the question another way: what *is* Mahāyāna Buddhism? For although the birth and rise of the Mahāyāna Buddhist movement is no doubt the most significant and far reaching transformation ever to occur within Buddhism, and therefore stands also as a major landmark in the history of world religions in general, in fact almost nothing certain is actually known about the event or its background. To be sure, such a topic is far too vast for any single researcher to tackle in its entirety, and perhaps even the efforts of several generations of scholars will not suffice to produce a picture half as detailed as that which has been sketched for us of the history of Gaul by scholars of European history. Nevertheless, I believe that with a novel hypothesis and an approach from a new point of view, some heretofore confusing aspects of the problem can be clarified and brought into new perspective.

The majority of past investigations into the rise of the Mahāyāna have been plagued by a fundamental misunderstanding. The focal point of this misunderstanding lies in the question of the institutional basis of the Mahāyāna movement and its relation with what I will refer to here as Background or Sectarian Buddhism. In the common

view, the Mahāyāna is regarded as a new institution, parallel to and organized in much the same way as the so-called Hīnayāna sects of Sectarian Buddhism. My hypothesis is that the early Indian Mahāyānas (plural!) were not at all institutionally independent of Sectarian Buddhism. Rather, the new movements grew out of, but were institutionally contiguous with, the sects of Buddhism as defined by the Vinaya lineages.

It is possible that a great deal of the confusion clouding the issue at hand is due to the names used to refer to non-Mahāyāna Buddhism. Among the most common choices are Hīnayāna, Sectarian Buddhism, Nikāya Buddhism, Conservative Buddhism, and recently Mainstream Buddhism.¹ There are serious objections to all of these terms, but for the present I prefer to use either the term Sectarian Buddhism or my new coinage, Background Buddhism. A “background” is something which provides a context, which sets the scene, and variations can be introduced upon and on top of it, but the variations cannot exist without it.² Background Buddhism points to adherence to a shared and generalized set of beliefs, practices and myths. This is not an undifferentiated, unitary background, but neither is it fragmented and wholly individuated. This is the sense I hope to evoke with the term Background Buddhism. The point of the appellation will become clearer as we go on, but the crux of the matter is this: we must avoid any suggestion of an organizational or institutional discontinuity between Mahāyāna and non-Mahāyāna Buddhism.

The implications of my hypothesis are profound. If adopted it will require a

¹ I set aside here the more contemporary tendency to replace Hīnayāna — a term felt to be abusive — with Theravāda. This is, to say the least, misleading and historically unjustifiable.

² In a sense, then, the term “ground” alone would suffice, were it not that “Ground Buddhism” is meaningless and ugly. I am aware that the implication that we then have something else in the foreground might be problematic. It has been suggested that, partly for this reason, “Mainstream” might be a superior term, since the focus would then be on the central current rather than the, as it were, by-ways. I think however that this understanding of my “Background Buddhism” as in fact representing the mainstream of Indian Buddhism prejudges the results of an inquiry yet to be carried out, and therefore hesitate to use the term “Mainstream”.

fundamental reexamination of various widely accepted theories concerning, for instance, the role of the laity in the birth of the Mahāyāna movement. It will also provide a new framework within which investigations of the doctrinal connections between sects of Background and Mahāyāna Buddhism may be pursued.

Some scholars who have expressed themselves concerning the institutional relations between Mahāyāna and Sectarian Buddhism seem to have been motivated by their interpretations of remarks made in the medieval period by Chinese pilgrims, travelers from Buddhist China to Buddhist India who kept records which report in detail the Mahāyāna or Hinayāna populations of various monasteries in India and Indian Central Asia. It is partly on the basis of these accounts that É. Lamotte, for example, wrote his highly influential study on the origins of the Mahāyāna.¹ Since the general and overall honesty and accuracy of the information in these pilgrim's records can be verified from archaeological and other evidence, there seems *prima facie* to be little reason to question their accounts. But the interpretation of these accounts is not always straightforward, and it is perhaps ironic that Auguste Barth, basing his ideas of the relationship between the Mahāyāna and the Hinayāna on exactly the same accounts, reached conclusions diametrically opposed to those of Lamotte, as we will see below.

Among the writings of the Chinese traveller-monks Faxian, Xuanzang and Yijing,² that of Yijing, the *Record of Buddhist Practices*, dating from 691, is the only one which makes a point of carefully defining its terminology. This makes it, for us, probably the most important of the available accounts. Yijing's crucial definition runs as follows:³ "Those who worship the Bodhisattvas and read the Mahāyāna Sūtras are

¹ Lamotte 1954.

² Faxian 法顯 (mid-late 4th century), Xuanzang 玄奘 (602-664) and Yijing 義淨 (635-713).

³ Takakusu 1896: 14-15. The text is 南海寄歸內法傳 T. 2125 (LIV) 205c11-13: 若禮菩薩讀大乘經名之爲大。不行斯事號之爲小。

called the Mahāyānists, while those who do not perform these are called the Hīnayānists.” In a phrase immediately preceding that just quoted, it is apparently stated that schools or sects may belong to either vehicle, and on this basis Junjirō Takakusu already observed almost one hundred years ago, in the introduction to his translation of Yijing’s work, that “I-Tsing’s statement seems to imply that one and the same school adheres to the Hīnayāna in one place and to the Mahāyāna in another; a school does not exclusively belong to the one or the other.”¹ Only two years later, Auguste Barth offered his detailed comments on Yijing in the form of a review of the work of Takakusu and Chavannes.² Discussing Yijing’s statement about the definition of the Mahāyāna, Barth concludes that “there were Mahāyānists and Hīnayānists in all or in almost all the schools.”³ He goes on to draw out some of the implications of this observation:⁴

The Mahāyāna thus appears to us as a religious movement with rather vague limits, at the same time an internal modification of primitive Buddhism and a series of additions to this same Buddhism, alongside of which the old foundations were able to subsist more or less intact. ... It is thus very probable that there are many degrees and varieties in the Mahāyāna, and that it is perhaps something of an illusion to hope that, when we define that of Asaṅga or Vasubandhu, for example, we will thereby obtain a formula applicable to all the others. All things considered, we can suppose that things here are as so they often are in this so unsteady and murky Buddhism, and that the best way of explaining the Mahāyāna is to not try too hard to define it.

At the same time, however, Barth remained extremely cautious. He suggested, even argued, that it was in Yijing’s own interests to persuade his audience that there was

¹ Takakusu 1896: xxii-xxiii.

² Barth 1898, while actually a detailed study in its own right, is written as a review of Takakusu 1896 and Chavannes 1894.

³ Barth 1898: 448.

⁴ Barth 1898: 449-50. As we will see below, I do in fact try to offer a working definition of Mahāyāna Buddhism, but there is certainly room here for a sympathetic appreciation of Barth’s uneasiness. On the problems of definitions of this type, see Smith 1987.

little or no fundamental difference between the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna, since Yijing was trying to propagandize among his Chinese compatriots, almost all exclusive Mahāyānist, the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivāda.¹ This is an insightful observation, and illustrates Barth's acute sensitivity to the multiple factors which could have been at work in the background of the statements of any of our witnesses. While it is certainly of vital importance to remain aware of and open to the possibility that such factors might have motivated the way our witnesses presented their evidence, I nevertheless hope to show that at least in the present case, whatever Yijing's motivations may have been, the truth of what he said can be argued for on independent grounds as well.

Barth's approach and his observations seem to have remained unnoticed by most scholars until Jean Przyluski, an extremely creative and iconoclastic scholar, again remarked on the relation between the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna. Having discussed, in his seminal study on the early Buddhist Councils, various Mahāyāna scriptures, Przyluski concluded:²

As rapid and as incomplete as it is, this discussion of the Mahāyānist canons allows us at least to recognize the insufficiency of the theories which have prevailed until now in European learning. The Mahāyāna has long been represented as a unique school which developed from the first in the regions of North-west India, from whence it spread to Central and East Asia. It is a subdivision of "Northern Buddhism." But this so-called "Northern Buddhism" is only a geographical expression. [The Mahāyāna] already appeared to open minds, like a shower of diverse sects oriented toward the North, East or West, and more precisely, each sect resolves itself in its turn into two distinct parts, one Mahāyānist, the other Hīnayānist. Without doubt one cannot negate the existence of aspirations, of great dogmas common to all the Mahāyāna

¹ Barth 1898: 450. It is actually the Vinaya of the Mūla-Sarvāstivāda that Yijing translated into Chinese. Although the relation between these two sects is not yet entirely clear, it would be well to avoid conflating the two whenever possible.

² Przyluski 1926-28: 361-2.

factions. But these convergent tendencies do not cause us to fail to recognize the remoteness of the original groups. Our analysis of the canons has shown us that there had not been a sole Mahāyāna issued from the Sarvāstivāda school. One can also speak, up to a certain point, of a Dharmaguptaka Mahāyāna, a Mahāsāṃghika Mahāyāna, and so on. The establishment of this fact, in addition to its obvious historical interest, has the advantage of allowing us, on many points, a new and more precise interpretation of documents and of facts.

Noting the opinion of Louis Finot that there is some contradiction between Yijing's description of Buddhism in Champa and the epigraphical evidence, Przyluski responded as follows:¹

The contradiction between the testimony of Yijing and epigraphy is only apparent. It seems inexplicable that for such a long time the Mahāyāna has been taken as a 19th sect, separate from the Hīnayānistic 18 sects. But all difficulty disappears at the moment when one admits the existence of a Sarvāstivādin Mahāyāna and a Sammitiya Mahāyāna — that is to say, of groups the canon of which was formed out of one or many baskets consistent with the doctrine of the Great Vehicle and the many Śrāvakaṭīṭakas belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivādin or Sammitiya proper.

I am in basic agreement with Przyluski's formulation here. Soon after the publication of Przyluski's remarks they and the earlier observations of Barth were noticed by Louis de La Vallée Poussin. La Vallée Poussin observed that the question of "sect" is a matter of Vinaya, of monastic discipline, and that the designation "school" is a matter of Abhidharma or doctrine. "There were in all the sects, in all the groups subject to a certain archaic Vinaya, adherents of the two schools, Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna, schools which are further subdivided into Sautrāntikas and so on."²

¹ Przyluski 1926-28: 363.

² La Vallée Poussin 1929: 234. In what is perhaps an isolated case in Japan, the same position was espoused by Tomomatsu Entai 1932: 332. There can be little doubt that Tomomatsu, who studied in France, was deeply influenced by Przyluski's thought.

La Vallée Poussin has clarified a very important distinction here, although later scholars have not always followed his lead. Since some confusion seems to have been caused heretofore by a certain inconsistency in vocabulary, it is perhaps best to clarify our terms here. By the term “sect” I follow La Vallée Poussin and intend a translation or equivalent of the term *nikāya*. A *nikāya* is defined strictly speaking not by any doctrine but by adherence to a common set of monastic rules, a Vinaya. One enters a *nikāya* or sect through a formal ecclesiastical act of ordination, an *upasampadā karmavācanā*. My use of the term “sect” here differs, therefore, from at least one established modern usage. A common presumption of Western uses of the term “sect” posits a Weberian dichotomy, even an antagonism, between Church and sect.¹ This is not the case for the sects of Indian Buddhism, as I use the term. All independent institutional groups in Indian Buddhism, as defined by their allegiance to their own governing Vinaya literature, are sects. The Buddhist Church in India is constituted by the sects.² There is no implication here of schism, of an old and established institution set off against a new and innovative one. It is this latter type of definition, however, which was assumed by T. W. Rhys Davids when he wrote about “Sects (Buddhist)” for the 1908 *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. Rhys Davids assumed the meaning of “sect in the European sense — i.e. of a body of believers in one or more doctrines not held by the majority, a body with its own endowments, its own churches or chapels, and its own clergy ordained by itself.”³

¹ van der Leeuw 1938: I.261 goes even farther: “[T]he sect ... severs itself not only from the given community but from the “world” in general. ... [T]he sect is not founded on a religious covenant that is severed from another religious community such as the church; it segregates itself, rather, from community in general The correlate of the sect is therefore not the church but the community; it is the most extreme outcome of the covenant.”

² The only meaningful candidate for a Buddhist Church in India is the so-called Universal Community, the saṅgha of the four directions. But this is a purely abstract and imaginary entity, with no institutional existence. It is something, in this sense, like the “Brotherhood of Man.” This Brotherhood, though it may exist, has no officers, no treasurer, no meeting hall, no newsletter.

³ Rhys Davids 1908: 307a. He went on to say 308b: “There were no ‘sects’ in India, in any proper use of that term. There were different tendencies of opinion, named after some teacher ..., or after some

The term “school,” on the other hand, refers to the notion designated in Sanskrit by the word *vāda*. Schools are defined primarily by doctrinal characteristics, they are associations of those who hold to common teachings and follow the same intellectual methods, but they have no institutional existence. A Buddhist monk must belong to a sect, that is to say, he must have one, unique institutional identification determined by the liturgy according to which he was ordained.¹ There is no evidence that, until some Chinese Buddhists began dispensing with full ordination and taking only “bodhisattva precepts,” there was any kind of Buddhist monk other than one associated with a Sectarial ordination lineage.² To break the ordination lineage in these terms would be to sever oneself from the ephemeral continuity which guarantees the authenticity of one’s ordination by tracing it back to a teacher ordained directly by the Buddha in an unbroken line of teachers, each of whom had in turn received ordination from such a properly ordained teacher. Thus the mythology, and perhaps the fact, is that if one’s ordination cannot be traced back in a line which ends with Śākyamuni, it is not valid. It is again La Vallée Poussin who offers a crucial observation:³

All the Mahāyānists who are *pravrajita* [renunciants] renounced the world entering into one of the ancient sects — A monk, submitting to the

locality ..., or after the kind of view dominant All the followers of such views designated by the terms or names occurring in any of the lists were members of the same order and had no separate organization of any kind.” I think this view is also questionable, but in any case the point is that Rhys Davids is applying here a very different definition of the term “sect” than I am.

¹ This point, and the terminological distinction, has been noticed and reiterated by Heinz Bechert a number of times recently. Bechert however refers in his notes only to La Vallée Poussin’s discussion.

² La Vallée Poussin 1930: 20 wrote: “I believe that in the India of Asaṅga as in that of Śāntideva one could not have been a buddhist monk without being associated with one of the ancient sects, without accepting one of the archaic Vinayas.” On the other hand, I mean exactly what I say by the expression “there is no evidence” This does not mean that there absolutely were no monks other than those associated with Sectarial ordination lineages. It means we have no evidence on this point.

³ La Vallée Poussin 1930: 25. The reference at the end of this quotation is a translation, although without any mention of the source, from the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (Wogihara 1936: 173.5-10). La Vallée Poussin had in fact quoted this passage years earlier, 1909b: 339-40, there giving the Sanskrit in note 1. At that time he also noted the difficulty of translating *kliṣṭā āpatti*, suggesting “un péché mortel.”

disciplinary code (Vinaya) of the sect into which he was received, is 'touched by grace' and undertakes the resolution to become a buddha. Will he reject his Vinaya? — 'If he thinks or says "A future buddha has nothing to do with learning or observing the law of the Vehicle of Śrāvakas," he commits a sin of pollution (*kliṣṭā āpatti*).'

In the same study, La Vallée Poussin concluded thus:¹

From the disciplinary point of view, the Mahāyāna is not autonomous. The adherents of the Mahāyāna are monks of the Mahāsāṃghika, Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivādin and other traditions, who undertake the vows and rules of the bodhisattvas without abandoning the monastic vows and rules fixed by the tradition with which they are associated on the day of their Upasampad [full ordination]. In the same way, at all times every bhikṣu was authorized to undertake the vows of the dhūtaguṇas. ...

The Mahāyāna, in principle and in its origins, is only a 'particular devotional practice,' precisely a certain sort of mystical life of which the center is the doctrine of pure love for all creatures: this mystical life, like the mystical life of ancient Buddhism which was oriented toward Nirvāṇa and personal salvation, has for its necessary support the keeping of the moral laws, the monastic code. The Mahāyāna is thus perfectly orthodox and would have been able to recruit adepts among those monks most attached to the old disciplinary rule.

After the time of La Vallée Poussin, few indeed are the scholars who seem to have noticed these observations or pursued the study of the Mahāyāna with an eye on this hypothesis.

It will not be out of place to emphasize here that we are, in fact, dealing with a hypothesis. I think that the hypothesis is suggestive and, at least provisionally, convincing, providing a good basis upon which to construct an imaginative re-creation supported by the available evidence. The fact remains, however, that we know far too little to

¹ La Vallée Poussin 1930: 32-33. In his preface to Dutt 1930: vii-viii, La Vallée Poussin expressed exactly the same sentiments.

confidently make statements such as “there is no way to become a monk other than x, y or z.” In fact, we know only what a few texts claim. A comparison of what the Vinayas tell us about monks owning personal property, for example, placed into comparison, as Schopen has recently done, with other types of evidence has shown us very clearly that there exists or can exist a considerable gap between the “rules” of the Vinayas and historical realities.¹ We should keep this in mind in what follows.

One scholar who has paid attention to the hypotheses of La Vallée Poussin is Heinz Bechert.² I think, however, that Bechert has gone beyond where his evidence leads him. He writes, for example:³

We learn from the accounts of Chinese pilgrims, and from the Indian Buddhist sources themselves, that there had been Mahāyānic groups in various nikāyas. Thus, a late text like the *Kriyāsaṅgrahapañjikā* still emphasizes that the adherents of Mahāyāna must undergo the ordination or upasampadā as prescribed by their nikāya before being introduced as Mahāyāna monks by another formal act. Thus, the outside forms of the old nikāyas were preserved, though they did not retain their original importance.

The claim that the old nikāyas did not retain their original importance is not defended, and as far as I know there is little evidence that would suggest this is true. What is more, without specifying what we think “their original importance” was, how would we begin to investigate whether this may or may not have been retained? In another formulation, Bechert has suggested the following:⁴

For those who accepted Mahāyāna, their allegiance to their nikāya was

¹ Schopen 1985.

² Bechert has repeatedly published more or less the same remarks, sometimes in the same words. See for example: 1964: 530-31, 1973: 12-13, 1976: 36-37, 1977: 363-64, 1982a: 64-65, and 1992: 96-97. Hisashi Matsumura 1990: 82-85, note 53, has also offered some bibliographic notes which indicate his awareness of the opinions of Barth and his successors.

³ Bechert 1973: 12. The reference to the *Kriyāsaṅgrahapañjikā* is evidently to Dutt 1931: 263. We may now add a reference to the interesting study of Tanemura 1993.

⁴ Bechert 1992: 96-97, virtually identical with 1977: 363-64.

of quite a different nature from that of a Hīnayānist: it was the observance of a vinaya tradition which made them members of the Sangha, but it no longer necessarily included the acceptance of the specific doctrinal viewpoints of the particular nikāya. In the context of Mahāyāna, the traditional doctrinal controversies of the nikāyas had lost much of their importance and, thus, as a rule, one would not give up allegiance to one's nikāya on account of becoming a follower of Mahāyānist doctrines originating with monks ordained in the tradition of another nikāya.

Whether or not this is partially or even totally true, I know of no evidence which might decide the matter either way, and Bechert also does not provide any. The point of this excursion has not been to criticize Professor Bechert, but to notice that our enthusiasm for our hypotheses should not serve as a licence to speculate freely and at will without necessary recourse to evidence.

While keeping this condition firmly in mind, we can nevertheless, I believe, suggest the possibility that the relationship between the Mahāyāna and the Hīnayāna has been largely misunderstood. At the same time, the distinction has not been absolutely made up out of thin air either. The concept of Mahāyāna movements is meaningful, but only in the context of some contrast with what is not Mahāyāna, this being generally understood by scholars to refer to pre-Mahāyāna Buddhism, although it need not. It is this non-Mahāyāna Buddhism that is often designated by the term "Hīnayāna." I would suggest, however, that the referent of the term "Hīnayāna" is not any existent institution or organization, but a rhetorical fiction. "Hīnayāna," in anything other than the usage of modern writers on Buddhism, designates "whomever we, the speakers, do not at the present moment agree with doctrinally or otherwise here in our discussion."¹ When the

¹ It is in this sense formally similar to the designation *tīrthika* or *tīrthya*, the former defined by Monier-Williams 1899 s.v. quite well as "an adherent or head of any other than one's own creed." The terms are, of course, derogatory. (It is perhaps also worth noting that, as far as I know, Buddhist texts do not refer to other Buddhists as *tīrthika*.)

scholar Asaṅga wrote in his *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* “That which is inferior (namely, the Hīnayāna) is truly inferior,”¹ his comment can hardly be construed as referring to an actual, specific, and institutionally identifiable group of Hīnayāna Buddhists. A fundamental error is thus made when scholars imagine references to “Hīnayāna” in Mahāyāna literature to apply to what I here call Background Buddhism.²

It may be largely due to the numerous vitriolic references in Mahāyāna literature to the “inferior vehicle” that some scholars, such as Stephen Kent, have found it hard to believe that there could be any sort of continuity between Sectarian Buddhism and the Mahāyāna.³ This misunderstanding is based on a series of erroneous identifications, which we can encapsulate as the equation: Hīnayāna = Śrāvakayāna = actual identifiable nikāyas. Or, as my friend Sasaki Shizuka has pointed out in conversation, in a critique of the views of Hirakawa Akira, one may point to the equally erroneous equation: *śrāvaka-yāna* = *śrāvaka* = *bhikṣu*.⁴ While it is probably true that all *śrāvakas* are *bhikṣus*,⁵ the reverse certainly does not follow. The polemical attacks on *śrāvakas* that we find in some, although certainly far from all, Mahāyāna scriptures should, I would suggest, be understood as a criticism not of all Sectarian Buddhist monks — which means, as I would

¹ Lévi 1907: I.10d: *yat hīnam hīnam eva tat*.

² By the same token, of course, it is one of the main arguments of this thesis that “Mahāyāna” is, in an exactly parallel way, also precisely a rhetorical fiction, having no institutionally identifiable referent.

³ See Kent 1982. Kent suggested that the rhetoric of Mahāyāna sūtras resembles the rhetoric common to embattled sectarian groups in various religions. He portrayed the contrast between Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna monks as one of great hostility, and emphasized the role of the laity as a force in forming the Mahāyāna communities and their outlook. Notice here that Kent’s use of the term “sect” follows the standard dichotomous Weberian definition, and essentially differs from the way I use the term.

⁴ I will discuss below the views of Lamotte, who considers the Mahāyāna to be anti-clerical. Hirakawa also believes that Mahāyāna texts are anti-clerical. His reasoning, as Sasaki has pointed out, is based on the idea that the so-called *Śrāvakayāna* is heavily criticized in that literature. But attacks on the *Śrāvakayāna* are not attacks on monasticism in general (that is, *śrāvaka* ≠ *bhikṣu*), but attacks on those who hold doctrinal positions which are worthy of criticism, that is anti-Mahāyāna positions. There is nothing “anti-clerical” about it. Nevertheless, as Sasaki has emphasized, this misunderstanding pervades Hirakawa’s work on the subject.

⁵ At least in Mahāyāna literature, as far as I know. On this point, however, see the interesting study of Peter Masefield 1986.

argue, *all* monks — but of those who do not accept the Mahāyāna doctrines. Since the terms Hīnayāna or *Śrāvakayāna* are not institutional labels but ideological ones, we might even loosely translate the term Hīnayāna as “small-minded;” it embodies a criticism of certain types of thinking and of certain views, but does not refer to institutional affiliations. I therefore strongly doubt, contra Kent, that the Mahāyāna literature which criticizes the Hīnayāna is a product of sectarians who isolated themselves, or were isolated, physically or institutionally. Rather, I would suggest that it is a product of groups which doctrinally opposed other groups within one and the same community or group of communities.

It is reasonable to speculate that in the very earliest period of Buddhism there existed a more or less unified single community, grouped around the historical Buddha, Śākyamuni. Whether any divisions occurred in this community during the lifetime of the founder is open to question — and the question is probably unanswerable — but in any case, evidence suggests that before long some sorts of divisions within the monastic community (if we may rightly call it a monastic community at this time) did arise. Traditional scholastic classifications have it that the original Buddhist community split into eighteen sects, that is *nikāyas*. The question of the exact meaning of this quite clearly legendary figure is not of interest to us here;¹ rather, we must merely acknowledge that there existed, in literature and perhaps in history, a number of different groups of Buddhists in the period preceding the rise of the Mahāyāna movement. And despite occasional lapses of care from which it may be intimated that I am talking about actual communities, in principle when I refer to these sects I am intending to refer to their literary remains, their own texts and references to their thought in the texts of others.

¹ In this regard see Otto Stein 1936, 1937. Recently, the mythical dimensions of the number eighteen have been noticed by Obeyesekere 1991, who appears however to have been unaware of Steins’ studies.

These groups, in so far as they may be identified at all, may be differentiated according to their monastic ideologies, as reflected in their Vinaya traditions, or in their various doctrinal formulations, presented in their sūtras, systematized in their Abhidharmas, or reported in later compendia such as the *Kathāvatthu*. I would like to refer to the complex of sects which produced these canonical texts and doctrines as Sectarian or Background Buddhism. This concept is in many ways similar to that discussed by Paul Harrison under the name of Mainstream Buddhism.¹

The concept of Background Buddhism is an attempt to get beyond, or behind, dichotomous ideas that pit Hīnayāna against Mahāyāna, or conceive of Sectarian *as opposed to* Mahāyāna Buddhism. The reason for not choosing only one appellation, but using both Sectarian and Background Buddhism, is the fear of the misunderstanding each alone might engender. To use only the term Sectarian Buddhism might be understood to imply some separate existence for Mahāyāna Buddhism, while the term Background Buddhism fails to sufficiently indicate the localization of that Buddhism in the orthodox sects. The terms are chosen in order to emphasize that the Mahāyāna should not be seen as a departure from, or in opposition to, the classical sects of Buddhism, but rather as co-local, compatible with, and as existing within, the Background Buddhist communities. It is perhaps primarily on the level of philosophical doctrine or “systematics” that the Mahāyānists distinguished themselves from non-Mahāyānists. To suggest an imperfect comparison, we might imagine the possibility of a contemporary American being an environmentalist, while at the same time also a Republican or a Democrat; the two roles or designations are not mutually exclusive. One may be an environmentalist and a Democrat, without conflict. The “institutional” label of Republican or Democrat is in no

¹ Harrison Unpublished.

way negated by any “conversion” to the ideology of environmentalism.¹

If the Mahāyāna arose from, yet remained within and intimately connected with, the sects of Background Buddhism in India, where do we draw the line between the two, how are we to define them as yet separate in their interconnection? Perhaps the interpretive model most commonly applied is one of doctrinal and philosophical evolution: Modern adherents of the Theravāda sect, the sole surviving modern sect of non-Mahāyāna Buddhism, consider the Mahāyāna as having evolved beyond the true teachings of the Buddha, and to be therefore a heresy.² Mahāyānists, on the other hand, traditionally see themselves as representing the true teaching, a return, as it were, to the legitimate doctrine of the founder, lost by the non-Mahāyānists. Such a formulation is essentially modern, but we will see below that it has roots far in the past, and is founded on an ancient ideological polemic.

I suggested above that Mahāyāna Buddhism is not institutionally separate from the sects of Background Buddhism. How then can we define it, how can we locate it? When we talk about Mahāyāna and the relation between Mahāyāna and Sectarian Buddhism, we are of course talking about people, Mahāyānists. So who were they? We can begin, therefore, with a definition, albeit somewhat circular, of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its adherents: “Mahāyānists were the authors of Mahāyāna scriptures, and a Mahāyāna community was a community of such authors.” One immediate and fundamental result of this formulation is that we must stop referring, at the very least provisionally, to

¹ I am aware that there may be objections to the validity of the comparison. I do not insist on it, but would point out that it is possible that many of those objections are motivated by the reality that we can imagine all sorts of problematic circumstances with respect to environmentalism and political identity, based on our contemporary knowledge, while we still know next to nothing of what it meant, in theory or to the individuals involved, to be identified as either a member of a sect or as a Mahāyānist.

² There is considerable evidence that there existed Mahāyānist Theravāda or Sthaviravāda at some point in Ceylonese history, if not also in Burma (where the ancient existence of a Tantric tradition is well known). These Mahāyānist movements however were wiped out, as it appears, and nothing of them remains save fragments of evidence, not all of it yet very carefully sifted.

“the Mahāyāna” in the singular. Until and unless we can establish affinities between texts, and therefore begin to identify broader communities, we must (provisionally) suppose each scripture to represent a different community, a different Mahāyāna.¹ We should note here that if each Mahāyāna scripture represents a different Mahāyāna community, we have gone farther in the direction of diversity than Barth, Przyluski, La Vallée Poussin, and others who suggested that we think in terms of Sectarian Mahāyānas, a Sarvāstivāda Mahāyāna, a Dharmaguptaka Mahāyāna and so forth. In fact, theoretically speaking we might even go farther still and say, with modern theorists, that each *reading* of a work which produces a new interpretation allows, although it does not necessitate, the creation of a new community. Radical re-readings, which amount to re-writings, may indeed create new communities, but access to this level of the tradition is all but impossible to obtain. We are here, as everywhere, constrained by our sources. I think that ultimately the essentials of the hypotheses of Barth et al. will prove to be convincing, but the fact remains that to build an edifice we must start by being sure that our foundation stones are stable, that our support pillars will not be pulled out from underneath by the tides of criticism.

If each Mahāyāna scripture denotes a Mahāyāna community, we must next ask ourselves: What, then, is a Mahāyāna scripture? The only reasonable answer, I believe, is to posit that those scriptures identified by tradition, for instance in the Tibetan and Chinese canons, as Mahāyāna sūtras should be so considered. Most efforts to second-guess such traditional attributions are based on preconceptions modern scholars hold concerning the nature of the Mahāyāna more than they are based on an even-handed examination of Buddhist traditions themselves. For the time being, then, it seems a

¹ In the case of some texts, as Shimoda 1991 has argued for the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra*, a given literary work may be the product of more than one community, as it grew over time. I do not necessarily agree completely with the details of Shimoda’s analysis of the case of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra*, but the general point is beyond dispute.

reasonable starting point to accept the traditional attributions.¹

I have mentioned several times now that I think it more accurate to refer to multiple Mahāyāna groups, to communities of the early Mahāyāna, rather than to employ the definite article “the” before the word Mahāyāna. Since I have defined these communities on the one hand by the texts they produced, which are of course multiple, and on the other hand as necessarily associated with sects of Background Buddhism, it is natural that we should speak of these Mahāyānas in the plural. So there may after all have been some reality behind the “imagined communities” theoretically constituted by the authors of Mahāyāna scriptures. The most likely hypothesis is that there were actual people — as I will suggest below, monks — arranged in multiple groups sharing Mahāyānistic ideologies. I believe it is reasonable to assume that various monastic communities distributed geographically over India on the one hand, and associated with different sects of Background Buddhism on the other, produced different varieties of early Mahāyāna Buddhism. Later it is likely that there was a kind of leveling, perhaps by the time of Nāgārjuna, leading to a more generalized “Mahāyāna,” in which originally distinct sources were treated and utilized equally.² The suggestion of this type of diversity in the early stages

¹ This should not be taken to mean that, with a certain hindsight, we may not find traditional attributions to be occasionally wrong. We do find, for example, that Chinese scripture catalogues sometimes designate alternate translations of Mahāyāna scriptures as non-Mahāyāna. We may note for example the cases of T. 1469, in fact a section of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, or T. 170, in fact a translation of the *Rāstrapālaparipṛcchā*. Neither text is recognized by traditional Chinese classifications as a Mahāyāna scripture.

I am of course aware of the fact that the classification of scriptures in China and Tibet (and doubtless in India too) was a polemical activity, motivated by a multitude of forces. I have had occasion to remark on some of the factors involved in the registration of works in Chinese sūtra catalogs, for instance, in my paper on the Guan Wuliangshou-jing, in progress. I find, nevertheless, the present approach to be a reasonable, though perhaps not the only valid, starting point.

One might refer to the efforts of some, notable among them Hirakawa Akira and Shizutani Masao, to classify and stratify Mahāyāna scriptures into “primitive” (*genshi* 原始), “early” (*shoki* 初期), and so on. I believe these classifications are based almost entirely on ad hoc criteria. I have serious disagreements with this method, and plan to discuss the problem on another occasion.

² I think as a clear case of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, dating from a rather later period, in which diverse sūtras are quoted together without apparent regard for their initial source or provenance. I think that the

of the movement is in harmony with the fact that, while apparently having some characteristics in common, various early Mahāyāna sūtras express somewhat, and sometimes radically, different points of view, and often seem to have been written in response to diverse stimuli. For example, the tenor of such (apparently) early sūtras as the *Kāśyapa-parivarta* and *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā* on the one hand seems to have little in common with the logic and rhetoric behind the likewise putatively early *Pratyutpannasamukhāvasthita*, or again the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* and *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* on the other.

When we read this sūtra literature, we should make an attempt to pay particular attention to its lateral internal stratification. By this I intend an analogy to archaeology, and would suggest that we should be able to distinguish not only vertical, chronological layers, one text being later than another, but different horizontal strata of texts which may be more or less contemporaneous. Texts dating to the same period may yet belong to different lineages, and may be the products of distinct communities. There seems to have been much effort on the part of many scholars to fit all Mahāyāna literature into one chronological progression, with little regard for the possibility that we may be dealing not with one tradition but with many. The subject of the present study can only be considered, at best, one of the multiple streams of the Mahāyāna. There can be little question that very different conclusions would be drawn from a similar study of the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature, for instance. A conflation of the multiple traditions of Mahāyāna literature into “the” Mahāyāna, that is into a unitary and monolithic entity, therefore inevitably produces considerable confusion and contradiction.

The very nature of this approach, letting the many texts define the communities which are grouped together under the general rubric of Mahāyāna, means that the community of concerns we will discuss here cannot represent more than one aspect of the

approach of this text to its materials reflects a sort of “leveling.”

many faceted Mahāyāna. It seems to me, however, that we can safely talk about the Mahāyāna ideology imagined by one text or group of texts without prejudicing the Mahāyāna ideology we may be able to extract from other sources. Ultimately what I would like to suggest here is that a certain, I think fairly consistent, view of a community ideology can be derived from the group of texts I have chosen to study. There may be a considerable overlap between this ideology and that found in other early Mahāyāna scriptures, and we may perhaps in all fairness speak of these overlapping features as characteristic of generalized Mahāyāna doctrine. On the other hand, there will be other features which, while allowing us to group our texts together into, and as representing, a community of concerns, at the same time set this community apart from others.

In addition to the problem of the multiplicity of texts, we also must confront the problem of the inherently fluid state of even a single text itself. The sources for the *Ratnarāśi* as we now have them are extremely homogeneous, which is to say that the Tibetan, Chinese, and fragmentary Sanskrit versions agree to a remarkable degree. If, however, we insist upon the vertical and horizontal stratification of the sūtra literature, are we justified in treating these admittedly diverse sources as a single unit?¹ Must we not rather treat each and every element in isolation? The only practical solution to the potential infinite regress we confront here is to treat as representative of an imagined community those materials which have a community of character or of value. To treat as a unit materials which we may identify with each other conceptually means that we may well be dealing occasionally with chronologically and geographically heterogeneous materials. We will sometimes actually know that this the case, as for instance when we refer below to passages in the *Sūryagarbha-sūtra* parallel to the those in the *Ratnarāśi*.

¹ In addition, aside from some indications of smaller differences even among these versions, there are quotations in later texts attributed to the *Ratnarāśi* but not found in the extant recension. It is not clear whether such evidence indicates a fluidity in the textual tradition of the sūtra or an error in the attribution of the quotations.

We have good reasons to believe that the former text represents a later stratum of the tradition than does the latter. This presents us with a certain problem of continuity and coherence.

Given that the sources through which we might locate Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism and its communities are by definition its texts, it is natural that in investigating the origins and early history of the Mahāyāna movement we should wish to avail ourselves of the earliest accessible evidence. Unfortunately, we have absolutely no reliable way of determining in just what that might consist. For despite a rather facile application of the designation “early Mahāyāna,” in fact, this usage is rather disingenuous. The reason lies in the fact that we have very little idea about either what sources belong to the earliest period of the Mahāyāna movement, or even how we might find that out. There may in fact be good circumstantial grounds for assuming, as Paul Harrison has suggested,¹ that none of the extant examples of Mahāyāna literature date, in the form in which we have them, to the period of the movement's rise, and so even the very earliest recoverable materials must in some sense be called “medieval” (in the chronological sense).² Almost the only hint we get to the relative chronology of comparatively old Mahāyāna materials comes from their Chinese translations, dating back to roughly the second and third centuries C.E. What makes us suspect that the literature is older still is the impression we get from this material (which is, admittedly, not always easy to understand) that it represents already a considerable degree of sophistication and development, rather than recording the first few rough steps toward an expression of a new and raw set of ideas. If this impression is right, we will probably never have access to the oldest stratum of the

¹ Harrison 1993: 139-40.

² I do not know if this is what Mochizuki 1988: 157 means when he says that “The *Mahāratnakūṭa*, viewed from the point of view of its establishment, may be called a Medieval Mahāyāna scripture.” 『大宝積經』は、その成立から見て、中期大乘經典と言える。At the end of the same paragraph, Mochizuki asserts that these *Mahāratnakūṭa* texts are certainly older than the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra*.

Mahāyāna tradition's literary expressions. This is a crucial point, since in fact the tradition's literary remains are virtually all we have. Whatever archeological or other evidence we might wish to employ can be contextualized and given meaning only through an examination of the tradition's literature.

Since each text or group of related texts can, provisionally, be taken to represent or define a community, we should be able to speak of the community of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*, the community of the *Sukhāvāṭīvyūha*, the community of the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa*, and so on. I would therefore like to begin by focussing in detail on one text, and more generally on one group of associated texts, which I will postulate represent the literary products of one imagined Mahāyāna community, as defined above. The present project is not, of course, the first to attempt such an approach. This procedure is in some ways similar to the method which has been adopted in his ongoing research project by Paul Harrison, who in this regard at least has followed the methodological lead of Hirakawa Akira. Both of these scholars have concentrated their research on the materials presented in the very oldest extant Chinese translations, Harrison specifically on those attributed to the translator Lokakṣema. By restricting the scope of his work to this corpus, Harrison has aimed at giving his work a sort of historical continuity: we know that the materials Harrison studies were available to one man in one place at one time. Since, however, that one place was in China, it is possible to question whether the picture obtained from those materials is more representative of a state of affairs in China than in Indian or even Central Asian Mahāyāna.¹ That is, since we do not know the relation between Lokakṣema's translations and texts available elsewhere, we cannot make the automatic assumption that Lokakṣema's Buddhism is equivalent to early Mahāyāna Buddhism. Harrison is in fact careful not to make this assumption, and it may be that at

¹ See Harrison 1987, and now 1993. Harrison is, I know, well aware of this issue.

this point there is no better way to proceed.¹

Another approach, from an entirely different angle and with a different goal, was taken by Gregory Schopen in his doctoral dissertation.² Schopen focussed his attention on the manuscript materials discovered at Gilgit. He thereby assured that the corpus of textual materials made the object of his study indeed belonged to a geographically and chronologically coherent community, and his study was therefore provided with an inherent continuity. Schopen, however, neither claimed nor aimed at access to a stage of Buddhist history earlier than the sixth or seventh century C.E., and in this sense cannot qualify as a study of early Mahāyāna at all.

I have chosen yet another approach, different from but I hope no less reasonable than these examples. I have focussed my attention for the present on one text, the *Ratnarāsi-sūtra*, and the collection of sūtras in which it is found, available in the Chinese and (based on the Chinese model) Tibetan Buddhist canons, the *Mahāratnakūṭa*. In its present form, the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection seems to be the work of the Tang period monk Bodhiruci and his collaborators. I intend to offer in the near future the results of a detailed study of the history and structure of this collection, which I hypothesize was compiled into its present and final form in an atmosphere filled with the polemical and political machinations of the late and post-Empress Wu period.³ That is, although the collection attained its final form through a process of composition which took place in China and influenced by uniquely Chinese conditions, it is my hypothesis that there did exist a core collection, upon which Bodhiruci based his compilation, which may be

¹ Since the scope of Hirakawa's project is broader than that of Harrison's, dealing not with the work of only one translator but of many, it is consequently also fair to say that the picture subsequently drawn on the basis of the material examined is correspondingly conflated.

² Schopen 1978.

³ More strictly speaking, therefore, one should refer to Bodhiruci as a monk and scholar of the Zhou-Tang period, since much of his important work belongs to the reign of Wu Zhao styled not Tang 唐 but rather Zhou 周. The Zhou dynasty was an interregnum in the Tang (690-705 C.E.).

ascribed an Indian rather than a Chinese or Central Asian origin.¹ What is more, whatever extrinsic historical connections there may be between some texts in the collection, there is no question that many show a great deal of internal continuity and consistency in terms of shared concerns, manners of expression, and so on. I would postulate then, if only as a step in our hypothesis, that select elements in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection belong to, or perhaps better define, an Indian Mahāyāna community, albeit of uncertain date and location. To be sure, such a community is no more than a theoretical construct, and even to speak of localizing such a community anywhere other than in the texts — for example in time and in space — is to entirely miss the point. We are dealing here with “imagined communities.”² These communities exist as perhaps nothing more than thought constructs, figments of our imagination which help us to understand our evidence in a certain, suggestive way.

It has been shown with a reasonable degree of certainty, by Nagao primarily,³ that the *Kāśyapaparivarta* is the centerpiece and logical core of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. The *Kāśyapaparivarta* is, in fact, almost certainly “the” *Ratnakūṭasūtra*. I have taken as a working assumption of the present study that those texts which are similar in content or approach to the *Kāśyapaparivarta* may be treated as representative of one community of concerns. I admit that this is a very conjectural step, even a leap. The success of our hypothesis, however, will be determined ultimately by the degree to which it provides a convincing model of interpretation for our data. In other words, I think it is true that, in the end, whether our hypotheses are accepted or rejected will be

¹ Much of the argument for this is, admittedly, speculative, and circumstantial. Limitations of space and time prevent me from going into the matter here, and I request the reader to wait for my future study.

² I might also suggest the term “virtual communities,” intending the term “virtual” in the sense in which it is used in the expression “virtual reality.” What one experiences in this way exists, but only as a construct, not as a solid, graspable reality.

³ Nagao 1973.

determined primarily or even only by the extent to which our interpretation of our data — the stories we tell — is convincing and compelling.

The *Kāśyapaparivarta* itself has already been much studied by many scholars, and furthermore is primarily concerned with the philosophical or doctrinal groundwork of the Mahāyāna soteriology, focusing on the concepts of emptiness (*śūnyatā*) and mind (*citta*). Much more could no doubt be said about this text, and I plan to offer my own comments in the near future.¹ Inter alia the *Kāśyapaparivarta* does present its vision of the ideal Buddhist practitioner and the ideal Buddhist life, but the text does not go into detail. Since it is these details which I have found most interesting, I have concentrated my efforts on a text closely allied with the *Kāśyapaparivarta* but more centrally focussed on the practical concerns of Buddhist monastic practice, the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*.

The *Ratnarāśi* has a great deal in common with the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, so much so that Prof. Aramaki Noritoshi has suggested the, I think very happy, expression that the *Ratnarāśi* is a sort of “appendix” to the *Kāśyapaparivarta*.² I suspect, in fact, that this is true in more ways than one, as I have attempted to explain below. The goal of the present study therefore is to explore the ideology of one tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhist literature by focussing on the *Ratnarāśi* and conceptually related texts.

It is essential to emphasize at this juncture that the object of study here is ideology, and especially the rhetorical activity of attempted self-legitimation that I believe can be detected in our literary sources. This is not and cannot become an anthropological inquiry. Our study is contextualized only within a frame of reference of other texts and their ideologies, not within a context of historically verifiable reality. For, despite what is

¹ I am preparing a critical edition of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese, along with an annotated English translation and study, in collaboration with Prof. Gadjin Nagao. I expect the whole will be ready for publication by the end of 1995.

² Prof. Aramaki shared his ideas with me in a conversation in early 1990.

sometimes claimed, scholars in fact can profess to know only very little of the actual history of early or even medieval Buddhism in India.¹ Almost all of what we know concerns the ideology of the Buddhist tradition: we are familiar (in so far as we are familiar with Buddhist literature at all) primarily with the generally self-conscious statements that the tradition has made an effort to record and preserve in its texts. We may further presume that the preservation of these materials was motivated by an end other than purely documentary zeal. It is one starting point of the present study to assume that Indian Buddhist literature contains not records of practices, or of events, or of history, but rather idealized models, expressions of aspirations, and imaginative mental projections of the way things should be. These texts are ideological documents in the sense that they were written to set forth a particular program, agenda or agendas, the function of which is to define that program as legitimate and worthy of support.

It is necessary at this point to take a moment to define a few key terms, namely “community” and “ideology.” Generally speaking, religious communities are associations of actual people, living or dead. Sociologists of religion have devoted considerable attention to the question of what defines a community, what types of communities may be distinguished, and so on.² I use the term, again, in a fairly idiosyncratic sense. For my “imagined communities” do not consist of real people, living or dead, but of imagined people, hypothesized people — that is to say, they are in a sense embodied concerns. The Mahāyāna communities which I have imagined by reading their literature exist only in a world of literature and of thought. To step outside or behind the texts as we have them, to supply additional information beyond that grounded in the sūtras themselves, is to move from the abstracted world of the text into the vacuum of pure

¹ On this point see Schopen 1985.

² For a brief and clear overview, see Weckman 1987.

speculation. What is embodied in the abstracted world of the text is an ideology. Books could have and have been written on this difficult concept, so it is incumbent upon us to define what it means for us here. One classical, non-Marxian, definition of ideology is “the set of integrated assertions and theories that constitute a socio-political program.” If we substitute “religious” for “socio-political,” and are willing to live with the ambiguity of the former term, this may stand as a usable definition of the concept. When I suggest, therefore, that a given statement in a Buddhist text is “ideological” or “ideologically motivated,” I intend to express my feeling that the statement represents an instance of a programmatic campaign to convey an agenda of ideas. One function of ideology, then, is to define a particular program or programs of social or religious action as legitimate and worthy of support. This usage of the term ideology brings it very close to the meaning of propaganda, which I do not use because I hope to avoid the emotive baggage that the latter term brings with it.

In many discussions of ideology, the Marxian notion that ideologies are inherently distorted is retained, even if the correlate that these distortions are based on class background is rejected. If we want to meaningfully retain the notion of “distortion,” however, we must at the same time be ready to claim for ourselves a higher standpoint from which we will be able to recognize any such distortion or deviance from reality. This contradiction has proved a stumbling block for Marxian theorists, and would be so for us as well. If we want to claim that the authors of Mahāyāna sūtras engaged in an ideological project in the (or a) classical Marxian sense, we must also be willing to claim that we know the reality of the background against which they launched their ideological polemic, encapsulated for us in the Mahāyāna sūtra literature. To some extent, now, we might in fact claim that our knowledge of the canonical literature of Background Buddhism gives us access to just such a background. But to do so would be to contradict

ourselves flatly, for would we want to claim that, while the literature of the Mahāyānists is distorted ideological rhetoric, the writing of the authors of the canonical literature is not? Surely we must treat the two literatures similarly.

We are on firmer ground if we dispense with the notion that ideologies are inherently distorted and distorting. If we are content to use the term ideology to refer to the integrated assertions and theories that constitute a religious program, the purpose of which is to define that program as legitimate and worthy of support, we will see that there is room to distinguish between reportage and ideology without introducing the element of distortion. Although the present study takes as its putative focus an investigation of the institutional position of one imagined early Mahāyāna community, that defined by the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*, it is more broadly speaking a study of the ideological constructs of this community. It is an assumption of this study that the authors, compilers, editors and revisors of the texts cited here had visions of an ideal Buddhist life, a world-view, so to speak, and consciously or not it is that vision which they have expressed in their literary monuments. When we read any given statement in these texts, then, we can ask ourselves what it is that the authors aim to say, what program they wish to promote. By asking ourselves these questions we should be able to draw for ourselves a sketch of the ideology of these authors, which is to say, we should be able to follow their polemics and spy out their world-view.

We may thus say that there are as many Mahāyānas and as many Mahāyāna ideologies as there are Mahāyāna texts — or more. For even the ideology of the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* itself may not be unitary and monolithic. For practical purposes, and because this is what interests me most, I will nevertheless concentrate my attention on one aspect of the thought and world-view of the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*: its asceticism and emphasis on the properly lived renunciant life as the ideal Buddhist practice. This

asceticism is an aspect of Mahāyāna thought that has been much overlooked by most modern scholars, or even ignored. I will discuss below what I think is one manifestation of this avoidance, namely the hypothesis offered by some scholars that the Mahāyāna movement is not a monastic phenomenon at all but rather belongs to the realm of lay activity. But even without formalizing their avoidance in this way, most scholars seem to have merely avoided thinking about aspects of Mahāyāna thought other than those concerned fairly directly with philosophical, metaphysical, or abstract doctrinal issues. To be sure, virtually any aspect of Buddhist thought could be called a doctrinal concern, but the point I want to make here is that there is a considerable difference between, for example, abstract discussions of the “perfection of discipline” (*śīlapāramitā*) or systematics concerning the ten stages of bodhisattva practice (*daśabhūmi*) and nuts and bolts deliberations over how a monk should comport himself on his begging rounds. One result of this is that what I believe to be a major feature of Mahāyāna ideology, or at least one variety of Mahāyāna ideology, has not appeared in our imaginative reconstructions of the thought world of Mahāyāna Buddhism. It is one aim of the present study to remedy this situation.

The very title *Ratnarāṣi* means “a heap or hoard of treasure or gems.”¹ For the authors of the sūtra, the reference is clearly to the life of strict observance of discipline, a life structured by Buddhist ascetic practice: this is the gem, and the text is a collection of advice on how to properly conduct oneself in order to realize for oneself and in oneself this jewelled goal. The monastic, ascetic, renunciant life is a treasure because it is the key to liberation from the suffering of the round of samsāra, not only for the ascetic but for those who materially support him. On the other hand, it is also important and interesting for our broader study of Mahāyāna ideology to note what is not in the *Ratnarāṣi*. It is

¹ The connection between this title and that of the *Ratnakūṭa*, a term with very much the same meaning, will be discussed in detail below.

lacking any concern with cosmology, with celestial realms, celestial bodhisattvas, or the “super-natural.” There is no discussion of Buddhahood, no attention to any sort of absolute, no *tathāgatagarbha*, no *dharmadhātu* and so on. The text is centered in the here and now (the narrative present), except for a basic concern with hell and karmic rewards. Essentially, innovative metaphysics and abstract philosophical speculations are entirely absent.

While there can be no doubt that the *Ratnarāśi* is directed toward or written for ascetics, it does have its place for householders. This place is as providers of the material support necessary for the renunciant to carry out his practice. And the results of this material support are the acquisition of merit. One of the great evils with which the text is concerned is the obstruction of the production of merit which is occasioned when the ascetic is not pure in his practice, and therefore cannot provide the opportunity for his supporters to obtain the reward due to them. This is a concern, of course, which the *Ratnarāśi* shares with many other Indian texts, non-Buddhist as well as Buddhist, and we will explore these ideas in some detail below.

The focus of the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* is thus overwhelmingly on the ascetic and renunciant life of the Buddhist monk. One might be tempted to characterize this stance as either conservative or reactionary, but such a specification would probably require a greater knowledge of the milieu out of which the writers of the text came than we presently possess. In other words, to label the authors of the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* as conservatives or reactionaries, and their work as conservative or reactionary, we would have to know that the community, actual or of thought, in which they lived espoused certain ideals to which they harkened back, that is, to which they appealed in their propaganda. We would need to have some sort of base-line from which to judge the nostalgic or innovative character of their rhetoric. We can suspect that the authors of the *Ratnarāśi* were appealing to a

“golden era” in bygone days, holding this up as the ideal for their degenerate times, but we cannot prove it. It is often a feature of reform movements that, at least on the rhetorical level, they present themselves as more orthodox than the orthodox.¹ Only much more comprehensive studies on the history of Buddhist thought than those yet available would allow us to contextualize the present work to the extent that we could identify the forces which could have been at work in the environment in which it was written.

Given this situation, I have not attempted to stratify the various, admittedly heterogeneous, sources bearing on diverse aspects of the *Ratnarāṣi-sūtra*, but instead have tried to give some idea of what may have been the background against which the text was written. This conscious conflation of sources extends even to the extent of ignoring the question of whether texts pre-date the hypothetical date of composition of the *Ratnarāṣi*; I have, more or less, treated all the texts cited in this study as equals in terms of their theoretical availability for interpretation of the text. In other words, I have not made any attempt to determine whether the authors of the *Ratnarāṣi* actually may have had or could have had access to any or all of the texts I cite in comparison. This assumption should not be confused with the opposite, and certainly historically false, assumption that the authors did in fact have such access. I will not argue that any given piece of literature I cite was or even could have been actually available to the authors of the *Ratnarāṣi* — this is something we simply do not know. On the other hand, there are numerous examples of set or stock phrases, clichés, found in both the *Ratnarāṣi* and through the canonical literature. While this can never prove familiarity with any given specific work, it may prove or suggest that the authors of the *Ratnarāṣi* were familiar

¹ In this context we might notice van der Leeuw’s remark (1938: II.614; the emphasis is in the original) that “living religion is in perpetual activity, and reformation is therefore not some sort of arbitrary act, but *one form of the very life of a religion*.” The operative implication, then, is that there is nothing particularly “unnatural” or out of place in a reform movement, which should be considered as one further aspect of a whole living tradition.

with the pool of clichés from which the authors of the canonical literature also drew their inspiration.¹ To say that the authors of the *Ratnarāśi* and those of another text were swimming in the same ocean is something, but it is not the same as claiming that they were doing it at the same time, or in sight of each other. In one or two cases the *Ratnarāśi* does seem to refer to stories we can trace in the canonical literature, and I have suggested in these cases possible sources for the versions incorporated in the *Ratnarāśi*. But these suggestions cannot, I think, ever truly be proven true. An awareness of this shared body of materials upon which authors could have freely drawn or from which they could have drawn inspiration will contribute to the re-construction of the totality of the thought world of the text and the community which it defines.²

How far can we go in our attempts to locate a Mahāyāna community, for example the community of the *Ratnarāśi*, in the geography of Sectarian Buddhism? Can we, in some cases at least, identify the background environment within which some particular Mahāyāna text was produced — and by extension or conjecture identify the background of a given community? I will suggest below the thesis that the *Ratnarāśi* perhaps belonged to a Mahāyāna tradition affiliated with the Dharmaguptaka sect. This suggestion is based largely on the position the text takes to the question of the stūpa's rights in ownership of property. Aside from the coincidence of characteristic doctrines, I am not sure how one would be able to specify the sectarian location of a given text and its communi-

¹ We almost must take cognizance of another problem, namely the virtually certain fact that there has been a considerable loss over time in the sheer bulk of available literature. While we may be able to speculate to some extent on the basis of still extant sources, much of what might have been good evidence for one or another theory has been lost forever, rendering many arguments inherently speculative.

² I will discuss the point in detail below, but it is perhaps necessary to mention now that the mere occurrence of identical or similar phraseology by no means guarantees that the *meaning* conveyed in context is the same in any two cases. It is in fact one of the characteristics of change within a tradition that old expressions are interpreted in new ways. To assume that the usage of a certain term or expression implies the same meaning or content would be to *prima facie* deny the possibility of evolution and change. This point has recently been made clearly and with wit by Eli Franco 1993.

ty. It is, however, possible to offer some preliminary speculations concerning how it could have been possible for such sectarian Mahāyānas to arise in the first place. We can approach this problem in two ways. First by asking — and this is an issue to which I alluded above — why there could not have arisen institutionally separate Mahāyāna sects, and second, by asking why would it have been unnecessary for such sects to arise.

Because the content of Mahāyāna texts shows a very high degree of familiarity — we might say a total familiarity — with virtually all aspects of Sectarian Buddhist thought and literature, it is very difficult to believe that the authors of these texts, the de facto representatives of the Mahāyāna communities, were other than educated monks. It is nearly impossible to image the Mahāyāna sūtras to have been written by anyone other than such monks, or rather more likely, communities of such monks. If we follow the classical reasoning as expressed in the normative Vinaya literature, the only way to become a monk would have been through an orthodox ordination lineage, one which traces its imprimatur directly back to Śākyamuni Buddha. At a very early period, perhaps by the time of the so-called Second Council, although we cannot be sure about this, there would have been no way to become a monk except through orthodox ordination into one of the sectarian Vinaya traditions. Unless there existed a tradition of which we are totally ignorant, then, — and this is not impossible — the only way for one to become a monk (or nun) in the Indian Buddhist context was through orthodox ordination. If we follow the assumptions just articulated, the immediate implication of this for us is that all authors of Mahāyāna sūtras, that is to say all those who went to make up the communities we have defined as representative of the early Mahāyāna, were at one time members of orthodox ordination lineages, members of sects of Background Buddhism.

Could the monk-authors of these texts, our prototypical early Mahāyānists, have split from those ordination lineages and the sects they defined? What would it mean to

leave such a sect and start another sect, given that the normatively defined ordination lineage could — in its own terms — not be broken? Without a Vinaya of their own, the break-away monks would have been unable to carry out further ordinations of new monks in their own lineage. It therefore seems to me that most probably it would not have been possible, in an Indian Buddhist context, for one to become a Buddhist monk at all without ordination in an orthodox ordination lineage. If this is true, Mahāyāna communities could not have become institutionally independent of Sectarian communities, for they would have had no way of effecting the continuity of the movement other than by conversion of already ordained monks. Such an approach to the maintenance of a religious community, while not uninstanced in world religions, is relatively rare, and difficult to maintain. Moreover, if these Mahāyānists were doctrinal rebels or reactionaries — which is also far from sure —, how could they have coexisted with their sectarian brethren? Would not it have been necessary to establish a new sect in order to freely profess their new doctrines and beliefs? It would not, if dissent in matters of doctrine was permissible.

The way in which sectarian affiliations are decided is not necessarily connected with questions of doctrine. An institutional split in a Buddhist community is technically termed *saṃghabheda*. Now, it has been suggested at least since the time of the Meiji period Japanese scholar Maeda Eun that early and fundamental Mahāyāna doctrines have much in common with the teachings of the Mahāsāṃghika sect.¹ It is therefore of great interest to notice the Mahāsāṃghika definition of *saṃghabheda* as offered in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya. *Saṃghabheda* is constituted by a failure of all the monks resident in the same sacred enclosure (*sīmā*) to communally hold the *uposatha* rite. Differences over doctrine are *not* grounds for *saṃghabheda* in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya. This contrasts

¹ Maeda 1903.

with the position of the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, for example, in which propounding an unorthodox view and forming a group of those who agree with that view is termed *saṃghabheda*. This point has recently been clarified by Sasaki Shizuka.¹

These facts suggest that if one wanted to maintain the theory that some Mahāyāna origins can be traced back to the Mahāsāṃghika sect on doctrinal grounds, there is also ample corroborating evidence to support the idea that monks who propounded new and even revolutionary ideas within a Mahāsāṃghika institutional context were yet in no danger of losing their good standing as Mahāsāṃghika monks, as long as they continued to perform the *uposatha* rite together with the rest of the monastic community. We are thus able to offer one speculation — and it is nothing more — about how it might have been possible for Mahāyānist ideas to arise within a Sectarian Buddhist institutional context.

There is also an entirely different type of evidence which may support the same type of conclusion. Recently Oskar von Hinüber, following the lead of Lore Sander, has tried to show that sect-specific linguistic norms can be established on the basis of texts extant in Indic languages. These norms are based on characteristic forms of words or syntactic patterns, the supposition being that certain subtle propensities toward spelling a term in a certain way, or using one grammatical construction in preference to another synonymous construction, may be due to sectarian differences in the sources of the texts or manuscripts.² Von Hinüber has approached the problem by examining prescriptions in the Vinayas concerning the careful and linguistically precise repetition of the ordination formulae of the *upasampadā karmavācānā*.³ He has identified many features specific, he asserts, to certain sects. For example, the distinction between the spellings

¹ Sasaki 1992, 1993.

² Such distinctions are of course lost in even the most precise Tibetan or Chinese translation.

³ See von Hinüber 1982, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1989, and Sander 1985.

pariṣad and *parṣad*, studied by Sander, is apparently characteristic of certain sectarian norms. If correct, this result is very interesting and potentially very important. Moreover, von Hinüber goes on to discuss an example of a clearly Mahāyāna text, the *Samghāṭasūtra*, recovered in a number of manuscripts from Gilgit.¹ Based on the same type of linguistic characteristics just mentioned, he identifies different manuscripts of this one sūtra as belonging to, respectively, the scribal traditions of the Sarvāstivāda and the Mūlasarvāstivāda. But this presents him with a problem, since he believes that as a Mahāyāna text the sūtra cannot belong to either one of these sects. Therefore von Hinüber suggests that such characteristic and sect-specific writing practices must reflect the unconscious writing habits of the scribes. That is, familiar with the norms of writing of Sectarian texts, the scribes continue to follow such patterns when copying a text of a different “sect,” namely the Mahāyāna. This hypothesis may very well be right, but by the same token the same evidence may be subject to another interpretation, if we follow the approach I have been suggesting here. Perhaps this Mahāyāna sūtra belonged to *both* traditions. Maybe it was not considered to be the exclusive property of a Mahāyāna sect or school separate or even separable from the sects of background Buddhism. The Gilgit *Samghāṭasūtra* may then have belonged to both the Sarvāstivādin Mahāyāna and the Mūlasarvāstivādin Mahāyāna sects. This would suggest that there were in Gilgit Sarvāstivādin Mahāyānists and Mūlasarvāstivādin Mahāyānists, as well perhaps as Mahāyānists belonging to other sects. I do not know how we might decide the matter at present (especially in the absence of access to von Hinüber’s data), but perhaps the possibility bears keeping in mind.

We meet at this point a potential problem in our argument. For did we not see above that while the vinaya strictures against schisms, *saṃghabheda*, in the Mahāsārnghi-

¹ von Hinüber 1989: 356. The Sanskrit text is available now in Canevascini 1993, who has printed, without variants, the text established by von Hinüber in his unpublished 1973 dissertation.

ka Vinaya allowed for doctrinal dissent, and thus the possible arisal of a Mahāyāna ideology within the sectarian environment, the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya deemed such doctrinal dissent schismatic? Is it possible to imagine that the Gilgit Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda communities did in fact tolerate such dissent, in apparent conflict with their vinayic stipulations? Even the oldest Gilgit manuscripts date to centuries, perhaps even five or six centuries, after the period in which the Mahāyāna must have first arisen.¹ Is it possible that the fundamental character of the relationship between Sectarian and Mahāyāna Buddhism changed significantly in that time? There is really no way to answer these questions, in part because we do not even know if they are well formed. To begin with, we do not actually know how far what was written in the various Vinayas was taken as the rule of law. Nor do we know what sort of consistency there may have been between different Sectarian communities in different locations. Moreover, it may be that with the passing of centuries this stricture of the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya with regard to the conditions for *saṃghabheda* eased, or perhaps on the other hand we have here a strong piece of counter-evidence for the interpretation of the Gilgit evidence I suggested here. I would put forward as one possibility that with the expansion of the Mahāyāna within India, the Background sects, including the Sarvāstivāda, grew tolerant of Mahāyāna teachings and developed their own Mahāyāna movements, even if they had perhaps not been not so tolerant at an earlier period. Again, whether they are ultimately proved to be right or wrong, for the present these are possibilities that bear keeping in mind.

It is one of the main implications of the hypothesis put forward here that the Mahāyāna traditions with which we are concerned at present are almost totally monastic. This is directly related to the supposition that they are institutionally contiguous with the Buddhism of the Background sects, and argues against the theory, offered by many

¹ von Hinüber has not yet published his edition and study of the *Samghāṭasūtra*, and he does not discuss in his published work the dating of the eight manuscripts of the text which he has studied.

scholars, that Mahāyāna represents a Buddhism of the laity, and is thus a radical departure from the older, established Buddhist church. I believe there is rather what we might call a “radical continuity” with the established institutional organizations, although as I have tried to clarify above, it is not possible (at this point anyway) to specify whether this continuity should actually be viewed as conservative, reactionary, or otherwise. What is more, I think that in a great many areas, this continuity between Mahāyāna and Sectarian Buddhism is not limited to the ideology of monastic administration and institutional organization but extends to the realm of more abstract philosophical, metaphysical and doctrinal concerns as well. That is, it might be fair to say that we find much in Mahāyāna Buddhism of both ortho-praxy and ortho-dox. I will nevertheless concentrate most of my attentions here on the orthopractic ideology of the *Ratnarāśi*, leaving to another occasion a more comprehensive study of the orthodoxy of Mahāyāna literature.

It might, at the same time, be helpful to briefly indicate why I have found myself unable to accept many of the ideas of perhaps the two most influential recent scholars of Mahāyāna history, Hirakawa Akira and Étienne Lamotte. The most characteristic ideas of Hirakawa and Lamotte are, respectively, that stūpa worship implies a lay community at the heart of the Mahāyāna, and that Mahāyāna texts are anti-clerical. At least for Lamotte, moreover, these two ideas are not unrelated.

According to Buddhist canon law, the normative stipulations of the Vinayas, the distinction between laity and monastics is defined by the difference in the precepts they take. A monk has taken the primary and secondary initiations (*pravrajya* and *upasampadā*), and has vowed to uphold a set of monastic rules (the *prātimokṣa*). A lay follower of Buddhism has taken the three refuges (in the Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha) and perhaps five, or eight, vows; in addition, he or she may vow to give up not only forbidden sexual activity but all sexual activity whatsoever. One who takes the three refuges, or

more, is called an *upāsaka* (male lay disciple) or *upāsikā* (female lay disciple).¹ There would in addition of course be those who casually gave alms and so forth, but these are not considered or recognized to be Buddhist lay supporters in any formal way. In spite of the availability of this terminology, many Mahāyāna sūtras generally seem to prefer the set of terms *pravrajita* and *grhastha*, that is, renunciant and householder.

Richard Robinson has suggested that rather than these technical and strict categories a more useful distinction is that between “laicizing” and “monachizing,” and “secularizing” and “asceticizing.”² By this Robinson means to emphasize tendencies toward lay participation or lay control, as opposed to monastic control, or a greater concern with worldly activities or values as opposed to the values of renunciation and ascetic practice. There is quite a bit of grey space in Robinson’s definition, but it serves to highlight the fact that a strict distinction between lay and monastic, regardless of the roles the individuals play in the social life of the community, can be misleading. His distinction allows us to speak of an asceticized laity, for example a householder who vows to give up sex with his wife altogether, or secularized monastics, for example a monk who lives at a royal court.

Lamotte, who strongly advocated the idea that the Mahāyāna represents the triumph of lay aspirations in Buddhism,³ used the expression “anti-clerical” to characterize early Mahāyāna sūtras, pointing specifically in his influential paper on the subject to the *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā*, which he calls an “anti-clerical tract.”⁴ It is true that the

¹ Let us recall the words of La Vallée Poussin yet again: 1925: 20: “Scholars set up between monk, novice and lay people a difference of degree, not of nature. All three are *sāmvarikas*, people who have accepted a *samvara* [vow - JAS].... All three possess the ‘morality of engagement,’ *samādāntaśīla*, the morality which consists not in the simple avoidance of sin but in the resolution to refrain from it.”

² Robinson 1966: 25-26.

³ He flatly stated this in Lamotte 1955: 86: “The advent of the Mahāyāna consecrated the triumph of lay aspirations.”

⁴ Lamotte 1954: 379.

single verse he quotes appears to be a violent criticism of monks.¹ But a glance at the context makes it quite clear that the *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā* is not criticizing monks in general and is far from anti-clerical — rather quite the opposite. The text is concerned with (future) evil and degenerate monks, and the decay of the true teaching. In this sense the text might be considered more a reactionary document rather than a revolutionary one. What we see here is not anti-clericalism, but again rather the opposite: a concern with the purification of the clergy, and the related assertion of its superiority and rightful place as the sole legitimate representative of Buddhist orthodoxy. We will return to this theme in the body of the present study, and observe there how pervasive this ideology is in Buddhism, not only in Mahāyāna sūtras, we will notice, but even in earlier canonical texts belonging to the Nikāya / Āgama corpus.

If, as I have argued, the Mahāyāna came into existence and persisted within Background Buddhist social structures, it would follow that all monastic members of the Mahāyāna must have been associated with a traditional ordination lineage. I have further suggested that the Mahāyāna texts must have been written by monks, and have defined my notion of a Mahāyāna community as one constituted by the authors of these texts. There may, of course, have also (or instead) been another type of Mahāyāna community, but it would be incumbent upon whomever asserted this to be the case to show how this could have been so. In fact, however, Hirakawa Akira does not believe the earliest Mahāyāna to have been a monastic institution, and suggests that formal Mahāyāna Buddhist social units did exist independently of the traditional sectarian saṅghas. He has offered an alternative solution to our questions, centering on the suggestion that what made such non-monastic Mahāyāna groups possible was their orientation around stūpa worship.

¹ He gives no reference, but the verse is in fact to be found in Finot 1901: 28.17-18.

Hirakawa holds the Mahāyāna to have been a movement promoted in contrast to Nikāya communities by non-ordained people who devoted themselves to stūpa worship.¹ One of the main presuppositions behind Hirakawa's thinking on this subject is the contrast between Nikāya Buddhism and the Mahāyāna, in which he was perhaps influenced by the writings of Nalinaksha Dutt.² The importance of this should be clear. If we compare, as we inevitably must, Mahāyāna Buddhism with its ubiquitous background, mistaken ideas about that Background Buddhism will lead to erroneous conclusions about the situation of the Mahāyāna. In one particular regard I think it is precisely here that Hirakawa has gone astray.

Hirakawa's ideas are based on a very wide reading in the Vinaya literatures, Āgamas, and Mahāyāna sūtras. Basically stated, his position is that the Mahāyāna grew out of lay communities institutionally external to the Nikāya Buddhist communities. These lay communities grew up around stūpas not associated with any Nikāya Buddhist sect, and the lay groups managed and administered the stūpas. Gradually they infiltrated the monastic communities, and in response to this there was a transformation within the monastic communities in which some of these outside ideas and practices were adopted. This is the genesis of the Mahāyāna.

Hirakawa's argument for this theory runs as follows: According to the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, just before the death of the Buddha he forbade monastic participation in the

¹ I translate as "Nikāya community" Hirakawa's Japanese expression *buha kyōdan* 部派教団. Although Hirakawa has published a certain number of articles in English, and an English translation of one half of his popular survey of Indian Buddhism has recently appeared (Hirakawa 1990b), I refer in all cases to his latest Japanese publications, on the assumption that these present his most recent and considered views. He has, moreover, been publishing a series of Collected Works in which many of his older studies are reprinted, sometimes with some modifications. When newer versions of old papers are available, I generally refer to the more updated publication. In the main, the ideas discussed in the present context are found in Hirakawa 1954 (reprinted in 1989).

² Hirakawa seldom refers to Western scholarly works, but does occasionally take note of Dutt 1930 — not however in Hirakawa 1954.

stūpa cult, ruling that this was the domain of the laity. In addition, since the cult of the stūpa consists in worship offered with flowers, perfumes, dance, and music, it would not have been possible for monks to participate, since such activities were forbidden to them by the Vinaya. In addition, that stūpas were not the domain of the monastic community is proved by the fact that there are no inscriptions on stūpa sites identifying a stūpa as belonging to a particular sect. All of this shows that, despite some suggestions that the Mahāyāna grew up from within specific sects of Nikāya Buddhism, it could not have been Nikāya sect monks who created the Mahāyāna. It must have been lay people who were the managers of the stūpas.¹

Gregory Schopen has recently shown conclusively that the standard interpretation of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*'s prohibition of monastic stūpa worship is wrong.² The sūtra is far from prohibiting monastic worship of stūpas, since the prohibition applies only to participation in the actual funeral ceremony, and moreover may apply not to all monks but only to Ānanda, and not to all funerals but only to that of the Buddha. Be that as it may, it is clear that there are no doctrinal grounds for the idea that monks were prohibited from participation in stūpa rites. Schopen has also shown elsewhere that in fact stūpas were a common if not central feature of Indian Buddhist monastery life, and that the main stūpas of monastic sites did in fact belong to specific sects of Sectarian

¹ I believe we can lay out Hirakawa's argument rather clearly almost in his own words: Hirakawa 1954 (1989): 377: Because lay believers 在家信者 erected the stūpa of the Buddha, and distributed his *śarīra*, therefore (故に) in the time when the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* was redacted in the primitive Saṅgha the believers 信者 were responsible for the administration of the stūpas, 仏塔の経営維持, and bhikṣus were not directly involved. Because Vinayas of the sects 部派 discuss stūpas they were taken care of by the Nikāya Buddhist communities 部派教団 in the Nikāya Buddhist Age (sic! whatever that is) 部派仏教時代. At the same time, there were many independent stūpas not connected with sects 部派. The many stūpas with dedicatory inscriptions which do not record a sect name proves there were stūpas not connected to a sect.

² Schopen 1991. Hiraoka Satoshi and I have recently translated Schopen's paper into Japanese. It is my intention to accompany the publication of that translation with a few notes on the Chinese sources for the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, all of which substantially confirm the suggestions offered by Schopen.

Buddhism.¹ As far as the prohibition to participate in dance, the offering of flowers and so on, Sasaki Shizuka has shown that this rule is not in the oldest stratum of the Vinaya tradition, and that even once introduced a specific exception was made for offerings to the Buddha, including stūpa offerings.² Given this, Hirakawa's argument against the monastic basis of stūpa worship can be shown to lack evidence, and with this falls the main pillar of his argument for the lay origins of the Mahāyāna. We may mention in addition the idea that only lay people would have been able to afford to endow such expensive structures as stūpas. Here again, Schopen has shown that contrary to the impression traditionally derived from a reading of the Vinayas, monks were not at all the completely penniless renunciants we sometimes romantically like to imagine them to have been. Monastics seem to have been wealthy patrons, and perfectly capable of endowing expensive structures, and moreover of recording this fact in inscriptions on those structures.

To be fair, Hirakawa has in fact repeatedly offered extremely detailed and learned arguments for the theories I have summarily critiqued here. A full critique worthy of his arguments would be involved and lengthy.³ Moreover, the model he suggests is not necessarily only his own. A recent sociological study of a new religious movement has clearly stated the presuppositions as follows:⁴

New movements in religion tend, in the nature of things, to be the product of lay initiative. They have often arisen as responses to what have been perceived as deficiencies in the clergy, and often as a challenge — expressed or implicit — to priestly dominance. In effect, that challenge has usually been a demand for opportunities of more open access to spiritual

¹ See for example Schopen 1979 and 1985.

² Sasaki 1991.

³ My friend Sasaki Shizuka will before long publish his critique of Hirakawa's theories on the origins of the Mahāyāna, and I may thus defer to his future work.

⁴ Wilson and Dobbelaere 1994: 232.

resources, accompanied by distrust of complicated liturgies and elaborate doctrines which the priests alone are permitted to claim fully to understand. The lay impulse has been to seek more immediate spiritual help with less of the manipulative apparatus in which priestly classes tend to invest. Consciously or unconsciously, the lay movement seeks a reorientation concerning the vital focus of spiritual endeavor (for example, by emphasis on faith rather than on ritual performances). Priests seek to preserve orthodoxy and become custodians of sacred objects and places. They mark off their purported piety by distinctive means of training, by tonsure, dress, and ritual routines, all of which lead them to distance themselves from ordinary people and everyday affairs which not infrequently they see as mundane, and perhaps even as a source of pollution. In such circumstances, laymen are sometimes prompted to seek new means by which to acquire protection from the untoward and for new sources of reassurance about salvation (in whatever form salvation may, in their culture, be conceived). Such a growing divergence of orientation is likely to be exacerbated if a priesthood — purporting to offer indispensable service — in itself becomes cynical, corrupt, and self-indulgent. A process of this kind leads a disenchanted laity either to have recourse to competing agents who claim to offer assistance toward salvation, or to take spiritual affairs into their own hands.¹

I do not mean to imply that Hirakawa has knowingly borrowed a model from the sociology of religion, but rather I want to suggest that this model is fundamentally taken for granted in much of the thinking concerning religious history, and especially that which is seen to relate to the evolution of “sects.” I cannot comment on the general

¹ The authors go on, in the following paragraph, to make explicit the application of their remarks:

The process outlined in the abstract applies to various historical instances, conspicuously to the history of Protestantism. The Reformation, whilst not an initially lay movement, met, with its doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, the aspirations of the laity, whilst subsequent dissenting and schismatic movements sought more direct access to saving grace, and wider opportunities for lay spiritual experience. Such struggles between priests and laity are by no means confined to Christian history: they have occurred in various religious contexts.

The authors continue, in an overly credulous manner, I believe, to discuss the issue of the schism between the Nichiren Shōshū and the Sōka Gakkai, relying almost entirely it seems on polemical materials (in English!) published by the respective parties, primarily the latter.

applicability of the model in religious studies, but even if the model *were* generally applicable, the fact would remain that there would be no necessary implication of its specific applicability to each and every case. I maintain that, regardless of its general applicability, this model does not and cannot apply to the problem of the evolution of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

As I have stated above, it is my overall project to offer an alternative model of what I think the Mahāyāna was, rather than to concentrate on a critique of the views of others. Taken in its entirety, this is a grand plan. For the present, therefore, I would like to explore only whether, with the definitions and understandings I have suggested, it is possible to produce a coherent and defensible reading of a single Mahāyāna scripture, the *Ratnarāṣi*. In other words, I would like to begin to test the hypotheses I have offered through a study of one case, that presented in the *Ratnarāṣi*. Is the ideology and doctrine of this text consistent with the nature of Mahāyāna Buddhism as I have hypothesized it? Does a study of the sūtra lend support to the suggestions I have made? These are the questions I have kept in mind as I have approached this case study.

This project is not, however, entirely straightforward. On the one hand, a full exposition and contextualization of this one text would be tantamount to a full exposition of Indian Buddhism, or at least of the Indian Buddhism pre-dating and contemporary with the *Ratnarāṣi*, since like any such work of literature it takes on its meaning in large part by being located in a continuum. From one point of view, then, unless and until we understand the continuum, we cannot fully understand any given instance of that continuum. On the other hand, by focussing our attentions on those aspects of the text seemingly most relevant to the questions raised above, it should be, and indeed has been, possible to locate several areas of especial interest and relevance with respect to our hypotheses. Ultimately, I think that it should be possible to show that there exists, across various texts

which represent one sort of (hypothesized) early Indian Mahāyāna, an ascetic and renunciant tradition which is very orthodox and conservative in its nature, not revolutionary but in fact reactionary. But the project to investigate a large corpus of material must still start with one case.¹

This said, I think it is by the same token true that the more limited goal of giving some sort of context, albeit incomplete, to one example of Mahāyāna literature, the *Ratnarāśi*, has been achieved here. I think it will be clear to any reader of the present study how far the text is situated in a Buddhist mainstream, and how much it reflects a certain sort of concern with simple yet fundamental issues of the renunciant and ascetic life. In this regard, I have also tried here and there to show how far the *Ratnarāśi* can be considered a truly Indian text, not just a Buddhist text. Many of the presuppositions of the doctrine of the *Ratnarāśi* are found in ideas shared by non-Buddhist, Jaina and even Brahmanical, renunciants in India. The discussions concerning alms begging offered in the *Ratnarāśi* have a great deal in common with those found in Brahmanical texts on renunciation, for example. I have not done full justice to this connection, but I think I have done enough to show that it is misleading to consider Buddhist texts solely in the context of Buddhist ideology, for these are at the same time Indian texts as well.

In order to elucidate some of the ways in which I feel the *Ratnarāśi* to be a classic

¹ The dilemma I felt may be stated another way: I was faced with a choice: I could attempt a careful, critical examination of one work, which I would then try to place into as wide and deep a context as I was able. Or, I could survey a large number of texts, each literally teeming with text critical, philological, and historical problems, not to mention problems of interpretation, and try to draw general conclusions from this necessarily superficial survey. I chose the former course. I personally have not read as much and do not know as much as I will need to have read and to know to achieve the more comprehensive study which I propose. In the present study I have also not explored as fully as I had planned, and would have liked to, the Nikāya / Āgama corpus in both Pāli and Chinese. I do not know how much we will ultimately be able to say about the context in which texts such as the *Ratnarāśi* were written, but I do believe that a broad familiarity with the literature of both other early Mahāyāna texts and of Sectarian Buddhist traditions — their Sūtras, Vinayas and Abhidharmas — will be a necessary prerequisite for any studies which attempt to discuss such a context.

example of the institutional identity of Background Buddhism and the Mahāyāna, I have concentrated on several themes, inherent I believe in the text itself. The main theme of the *Ratnarāśi*, broadly speaking, is the śramaṇa, the ascetic. We have several studies of Indian asceticism in general,¹ and it would perhaps be possible to offer comparative remarks. But I have been restrained by two factors. First, if the accounts of Jaina and Hindu asceticism in such works are as reliable as their accounts of Buddhist asceticism, we had better use them with considerable caution. Second, this work has already reached a fairly considerable bulk without venturing so far afield, and I wondered, were I to start that further journey, whether I would ever make it home. A full study which attempts to evaluate the extent to which Mahāyāna Buddhism is co-extensive with Background Buddhism will, however, necessarily also have to look into the question of how characteristically Buddhist any given feature actually is. This is a task for the future.

I believe that it is part of the Mahāyāna Buddhist project to locate its ideals firmly within the context of the older, classical Buddhism. In many ways the present study then is about ideals. It is about ideal śramaṇas, ideal monks, ideal ascetic practice, and ideal life. It is, I would suggest, significant that the *Ratnarāśi* is not concerned with ideal attainments, or things similarly distant. The Mahāyāna is localized with respect to Background Buddhism not in terms of abstract doctrine but in terms of practice and institutions. The concern in our sūtra is focussed on very practical and down to earth discussions of what is possible for monastic men (women are almost entirely absent from this world, other than as objects of disgust). For although some apparently closely related texts such as the *Ugradattapariṣcchā* do spend a good deal of time addressing the place of the not fully ordained Buddhist follower (in the case of the *Ugradattapariṣcchā*, the so-called householder bodhisattva), the householder in the *Ratnarāśi* is envisioned only

¹ For example, Chakrabarti 1973, and Bhagat 1976.

as the source of material support for the ascetic practitioner.

On the other hand, there is not much of the explicit ideal past in the *Ratnarāṣi*. To be sure, there are appeals to both past events, such as Śākyamuni's presentation of his robes to Kāśyapa, and future rewards such as rebirth in the time of Maitreya. But explicit recollections of an ideal past are absent. This stands in some contrast to other Buddhist discussions of corruption and decline, in which explicit appeal is made to an ideal past. But as Walpola Rahula has observed, this phenomenon should not be confused with history:¹

It is both a curious fact and a universal tendency that humanity always believes that the past was the best state of all, the present is bad and the future will be worse. All good and holy men, regarded as saints and arahants, lived in the past; contemporary men and affairs are corrupt and degenerate; after us, the future will be increasingly worse. This ideal past, which in reality never existed, drifts further and further away like a mirage as one draws near it. If one dives deep into that "ideal past" and investigates the experiences of those who lived then, it will be found that they were equally dissatisfied with the contemporary state of affairs, and that they themselves had their eyes fixed on an ever-retreating "ideal past."

This formulation is very revealing, and may well apply to much of the Buddhist discourse on corruption and impurity. But it does not seem to apply to the *Ratnarāṣi*, in which the ideal seems to be recognized as potentially present in the here and now, and not as necessarily always locked in some ever-retreating past.

Much of the argument for the localization of institutional Mahāyāna Buddhism in the sects comes from details, and therefore much of this study concentrates on just such details. An example is the examination of the ideal practitioner. Part of the potentially realizable ideal of the *Ratnarāṣi* is encapsulated in its idea of the *yogācāra bhikṣu*, the

¹ Rahula 1956: 199.

monk who devotes himself primarily to meditative cultivation. Although there is certainly significant emphasis placed on such ascetic practices as wilderness dwelling, alms begging practice, and the practice of wearing rag robes, it is obvious, I think, that the ideal Buddhist practitioner envisioned by the authors of the *Ratnarāśi* is the monk who quietly and without disruption applies himself to meditative cultivation. There is little attention given here to the content of those meditations, but the entire discussion of the role of the supervisory administrative monk, for example, shows that it is above all his primary role to protect and encourage the meditative specialist. In the exploration of just who this meditative specialist is, I have been able to show that this is very likely an ideal type shared with or even borrowed from the Vinaya and Abhidharma traditions of Sectarian Buddhism.

A different type of connection between the *Ratnarāśi* and Background Buddhism appears in the context of an inquiry into the selection of Kāśyapa as the interlocutor for the exposition of the sūtra. Why was Kāśyapa chosen, and what effect does this have on the contextualization and legitimation of the text? Further studies may take account of other cases in which we could equally well explore the same issues, with regard for instance to the names of such texts as the *Ugradattapariṇṇāhā* and *Rāṣṭrapālapariṇṇāhā*, both of which borrow their very titles from the earlier canonical tradition.

Linked to Kāśyapa by the text itself is the imagery of the refuse rag robes. I suggest that this image is taken by the *Ratnarāśi* as a paradigm for ascetic practices in general, and asceticism is, of course, one of the key conservative or even reactionary characteristics of Background Buddhism. The same theme continues in the exploration of the ideal monk, the *yogācāra bhikṣu*, and that of his antithesis, the corrupt and degenerate monk. The imagery of the *Ratnarāśi* with regard to the latter is particularly memorable, and shows strong influence from the earlier canonical literature. Final themes I have

also explored are the importance of meritorious activity and of the practitioner being a fit recipient of gifts given by faithful donors, and what sort of administrative organization of the renunciant life is presupposed by the authors of the *Ratnarāṣi* in their discussion of the supervisory administrative monk.

These themes have not been chosen at random. The *Ratnarāṣi* is structured in a very neat and coherent way, and the themes I have explored are suggested by the presentation of the text itself. The topics seem to be introduced quite systematically, by chapter.

I would suggest that we can arrange the chapters into groups as follows:

- | | |
|------|---|
| I) | 1) Śramaṇa, and 2) Monk |
| II) | 3) Outcaste |
| III) | 4) Supervision |
| IV) | 5) Wilderness dweller, 6) Alms begging, and 7) Refuse rag robes |

Group I presents a more-or-less theoretical framework for the whole. It is here that we find lengthy lists of doctrinal categories, fulfilling which the practitioner may be considered a true śramaṇa or monk. In addition, most of the other themes which will be developed later in the text are introduced, such as the central importance of the robes, the evil of dishonest śramaṇic practice, and the importance of the gift of faith. In group II various types of dishonest and immoral śramaṇas are discussed, and the vital role of purity in the acceptance of gifts of faith from supporters of the community is emphasized. Group III turns our attention to the role of the monastic administrative monk, and the responsibility he holds for assuring the smooth running of the community and the ability of monks specialized in various practices to carry out those practices without interruption. In this latter context the *yogācāra* or meditative monks is given special prominence. Finally, in group IV the three fundamental ascetic practices are discussed in considerable detail, and the proper mental attitude with which the practitioner should cultivate these

practices is emphasized. That the very structure and tone of the text itself reminds us of Vinaya works cannot be ignored in any consideration of the institutional relations between Background Buddhism and the Mahāyāna.

The present study can only be a beginning, a small step toward a more comprehensive consideration of the overall hypotheses offered here. In the following I have attempted to show that a carefully study of the *Ratnarāśi* does not contradict the hypotheses I have offered concerning the nature of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Whether I have accomplished more is for the reader to decide.

Chapter 2

Kāśyapa and Maitreya

One way in which we may gain a better understanding of the tradition and currents of the literature of the early Mahāyāna is to investigate its protagonists. Specifically, in the present case we may inquire into why it may have been that Mahā-Kāśyapa was selected as the central protagonist in the *Ratnarāśi*, *Kāśyapaparivarta*, many other texts of the *Mahāratnakūṭa*, and in fact in many Mahāyāna scriptures in general. It is an assumption of the quest to answer this question that his selection reflects a purposeful choice, and that it is Kāśyapa's character and history, in other words the associations that his presence and activity would evoke in the minds of the texts' authors and audience, perhaps particularly with regard to his position in classical Buddhism, that led Mahāyāna authors to chose him as their mouthpiece. Specifically, as Dantinne has suggested:

Mahākāśyapa, the guardian of brahmanical ideology and zealous practitioner of ascetic forest dwelling (*āraṇyaka*), plays the part of the propagator of "progressive" tendencies which will play a more and more important role in the heart of the community immediately after the death of the Buddha.¹

A full study of the figure of Kāśyapa, while certain to shed light on diverse issues of Buddhist history, is not our current task.² We are forced by the constraints of time, space and context to limit ourselves to investigating those aspects of the persona of

¹ Dantinne 1991: 82, n. 81.

² For a few remarks on Kāśyapa, see Lamotte 1962: 149-50, note 18, and the sources mentioned there. A "biography" of Mahākāśyapa in Buddhaghosa's commentary to the *Āṅguttara Nikāya*, the *Manorathapūraṇī* I.161,17-183,17, has been translated in Oikawa 1987. Hecker 1987 is a composite story of the life of Mahākassapa based on Pāli sources.

Kāśyapa most likely to shed light on his role in early Mahāyāna literature, and its relation to Background Buddhism.

Already in the Nikāya / Āgama corpus, Kāśyapa is characterized as that one among the disciples of the Buddha who is first in preaching or practicing the dhuta ascetic purification practices,¹ and even as that disciple who, having practiced the twelve dhuta ascetic purification practices and well devoted himself to the cultivation, under past buddhas, of the practice of purity (*brahmacarya*), now is always ready to help the future buddha Maitreya in his work of guiding the people.² In one *sutta* of the *Samyutta Nikāya*, the Buddha offers to Kāśyapa the chance to give up his ascetic practices, and instead wear clothes obtained by donation rather than those picked up from garbage heaps, and to eat at the invitation of donors rather than by the uncertain course of begging. Kāśyapa declines, and insists on maintaining his practice of wilderness dwelling (*araññaka*), alms begging (*piṇḍapātika*), wearing rag robes (*pamsukūlika*), owning only one set of robes (*tecīvarika*), and so on.³ That is, he turns down the chance to live a more certain, less peripatetic life and chooses to continue following the more ascetic practices just named. In another *sutta* that follows almost directly after, the Buddha laments to Kāśyapa that the senior monks now have little interest in such practices and little respect for those who engage in them.⁴ Overall, it is fair to say that the image of

¹ AN i.23,16-20: *etad aggaṃ bhikkhave mama sāvakānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ ... dhutavādānaṃ yad idam Mahākassapo*. Note that the PTS edition cites a Burmese variant for *dhutavādāna* as *dhūtaṅgadharāna*. In Chinese see the *Ekottarāgama* T. 125 (II) 557b4, 8-9 我聲聞中第一比丘...十二頭陀難得之行所謂大迦葉比丘是。"The premier monk among my auditors ... for the difficult practice of the twelve dhuta ascetic purification practices is the monk Mahākāśyapa." *Divyāvadāna* 61.27-29 has *ayaṃ śrāvakaḥ Kāśyapo nāmnālpecchānāṃ saritustānāṃ dhūtaguṇavādināṃ agro nirdiṣṭaḥ*; the same is found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Bhaisajyavastu* T. 1448 (XXIV) 25b1-2. Such references could easily be multiplied.

² *Ekottarāgama* T. 125 (48.3) (II) 788c26-28: 如我今日弟子之中大迦葉者。行十二頭陀過去諸佛所善修梵行。此人常佐彌勒勸化人民。

³ The passage is SN ii.202,6-203,26 (XVI.5), with the same in the *Samyuktāgama* T. 99 (1141) (II) 301c7-29 = T. 100 (116) (II) 416b8-c6.

⁴ SN ii.208,13-210,22 (XVI.8).

Kāśyapa in the corpus of earlier materials is as a strict, ascetic, renunciant figure.

These ascetic practices favored by Kāśyapa are to some extent connected with reactionary and possibly extreme tendencies in Buddhist doctrines concerning praxis, a fact which is emphasized by the coincidence of several of the dhuta ascetic purification practices with those practices advocated by Devadatta but rejected by the Buddha as too severe to enjoin upon all monks. This characteristic alone should be enough to attract our interest, since it is surely significant that the authors of Mahāyāna texts should have chosen as their spokesman a figure associated with what are, at least for certain groups, potentially reactionary ideas. But as I have suggested, it is exactly this tendency which we should consider as central and characteristic: Kāśyapa, the guardian of asceticism, may represent at least one stream of early Mahāyāna thought precisely because he stands for an extreme dedication to fundamentals of renunciant monasticism.

Though in (literary) life Kāśyapa is certainly a personage of great interest, again in death, or rather “after-life,” he plays a not inconsiderable role. For not only does Kāśyapa accept the charge of the Buddha to preserve and transmit the teachings, that is to become the Buddha’s temporal heir,¹ but according to a widely transmitted tradition he vows to carry the torch — or more literally, the robe — of the Buddha’s teachings and transmit it to the next buddha to arise in this world-realm, Maitreya. This will lead us, unfortunately, into rather muddy waters, but plunge in we must to explore the relation between Kāśyapa and Maitreya.²

¹ As Schopen (1992: 31, note 46) has pointed out, Kāśyapa is “legally” the heir of the Buddha, and this is, for instance, the reason that he must re-perform his funerals. See for example the expression in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya *Bhaiṣajyavastu* (Dutt 1939-59: iii.260.5-6): Referring to the time just before the Buddha’s death it says “The entire community (*śāsana*) was entrusted by the Blessed One to Mahākāśyapa,” *bhagavatāyusmate mahākāśyapāya kṛtsnaṁ śāsanam upanyastam*.

² This connection has been studied in detail several times. See in particular Lamotte 1944-80: 190-96, with copious notes; Sakurabe 1965; Kumoi 1992, esp. 89-92; and Lévi 1929: 40-46. In addition to these studies, on Maitreya more generally one may refer in the first place to the excellent synthesis in Lamotte 1958: 775-88. The following are also important studies: Akanuma 1939: 194-216; Demiéville

The mainstream story recounts that Kāśyapa, when his time in this world came to an end, entered a mountain to await the coming of Maitreya, and pass on to him Śākyamuni's robe.¹ As Sakurabe has pointed out, this story emphasizes the connection and continuity between the teaching of Śākyamuni and that of Maitreya through the vehicle of Kāśyapa.² The robe in this narrative appears to serve as a symbol or emblem of Śākyamuni's teaching, as indeed the *Mahāvamsa* has understood it: Kāśyapa considers that the Buddha "had given him his garment, and had (thereby) made him equal with himself"³ We will thus expect the story of Kāśyapa's acquisition of Śākyamuni's robe to confirm its importance.⁴

The common story of Kāśyapa's acquisition of the Buddha's robe is well known through the version in Pāli in the *Samyutta Nikāya*, but it appears in Chinese as well. Since the Pāli version is already widely available in English, I translate one of the

1920, Kagawa 1963; Leumann 1919, Lévi 1932, Matsumoto 1911, Peri 1911. For further reference, one may refer to: Baruch 1947; Hikata 1973a, 1973b; S. Kimura 1982, 1983; La Vallée Poussin 1928; Sadakata 1981; M. Shimizu 1978; Sponberg and Hardacre 1988; and Tokiya 1979.

It may be apposite to notice here the frequent suggestions that Maitreya should be associated with Iranian traditions. I have nothing to add to this debate, except to note that since long ago there has been a suggestion that we see in the connection between Kāśyapa and Maitreya some reflection of the Iranian connection between Keresaspa and Saošyant. See Abegg 1928: 242; Przyluski 1923: 178-79, 1929: 11; and Natier 1988: 46, note 60. Przyluski 1929: 11 suggested that "although Kāśyapa may not be identical with Keresaspa, the resemblance of the two names is palpable enough that, in transposing the Iranian fable, the Buddhist story-tellers chose Kāśyapa as being the one among the disciples of the Buddha whose name was closest to Keresaspa." I am not capable of deciding whether this hypothesis is reasonable or not, but given the likelihood of some sort of connection between Maitreya and Iran, it should perhaps not be dismissed out of hand.

¹ The story in this form is found in many places: *Ekottarāgama* T. 125 (48.3) (II) 788c28-789a21 = 彌勒下生經 T. 453 (XIV) 422b12-c4 [see B. Matsumoto 1911: 23, Peri 1911: 444, 449-50]; *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Kṣudrakavastu* T. 1451 (XXIV) 409b28-c6, translated in Przyluski 1914: 527-28; *Āśokarājavadāna* T. 2042 (L) 114c18-21, translated in Przyluski 1923: 331-32, 115a15-28, translated in Przyluski 1923: 333-34; *Āśokarājasūtra* T. 2043 (L) 154a28-29.

² Sakurabe 1965: 38-39.

³ *Mahāvamsa* III.7, translated in Geiger 1912: 15.

⁴ It is perhaps not totally irrelevant to mention a hypothesis, which I will discuss in detail elsewhere, that there is a particular Indian tale motif in which an important identification is effected by an article of clothing or cloth. This is the case in one Oedipal story studied by Ramanujan, and appears also in the Buddhist parallel I discovered. I refer the reader for further details to my forthcoming paper.

Chinese versions here:¹

The Venerable Mahākāśyapa spoke to Ānanda saying: From the time that I renounced the world, I never knew that there were any other teachers, only the Tathāgata, Perfect and Complete Buddha. When I had not yet renounced the world, I always pondered birth, old age, disease and death, grief and lamentation, unhappiness and suffering. I knew that the home life is rough and full of all kinds of defilements, and that renouncing the world is free, open space. It is hardly possible for the householder to take his place in the homeless state, single mindedly clear, extinguishing even his body and life, totally and fully pure, the practice of purity (**brahmacaryā*) clear and good. I should cut off my hair and beard, and put on the ochre robes. Full of faith, without a home I shall renounce the world in order to pursue awakening.

Taking a robe worth a hundred thousand pieces of gold I rent the fabric into pieces and made it into a *saṅghāṭī* (upper) robe.² Following the Arhats of the world, I learned from them and renounced the world. Having renounced the world, I went to the stūpa of Bahuputraka in between Rājagṛha and Nālanda. There I met the Blessed One, with perfect body, sitting straight up, with beautiful countenance, his senses calmed, completely at ease, like a golden mountain. When I saw him I thought: “This is my teacher, this is the Blessed One, this is the Arhat, this is the Perfect and Complete Buddha.”

Then with palms joined together I made reverent obeisance to him with a single pointed mind, and I spoke to the Buddha saying: “You are my

¹ In Chinese we have T. 99 (1144) (II) 303a22-b29, which I translate here, and T 100 (119) (II) 418a23-c14. The corresponding passage in Pāli is SN ii.219,24-221,21. Virtually the same is found in the *Mahāvastu* iii.50,6-54,14. The same reference is also found in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* T. 1509 (XXV) 225a4-5, translated in Lamotte 1944-80: 1399.

² Pāli has here *paṭapilotikānaṃ saṅghāṭiṃ karitvā* (SN ii.219,31-220,1). The terminology here is not absolutely clear, but there seems to be no special indication that the robes are of high quality. Lamotte 1944-80: 1399, however, refers to the commentary on this passage (*Sāratthappakāsinī*, Smith 1932: ii.180,14-17), in which the cloth rendered into pieces is referred to as “garments of great price.” We find the following: “... Tearing apart cloth of great price, he made a monastic robe out of it, so it is said “a monastic robe made out of cloth.” *paṭapilotikānaṃ ti chinnapilotikānaṃ. terasahattho pi hi navasāṭako dasācchinnakālato paṭṭhāya pilotikā ti vuccati. iti mahārahāṇi vatthāni chinditvā kataṃ saṅghāṭiṃ sandhāya paṭapilotikānaṃ saṅghāṭiṃ ti vuttam.* In the *Mahāvastu* (Mv. iii.50,15) the robes are of cotton: *ekam karpāsikaṃ paṭapilotikam ādāya.*

teacher, I am your disciple.”

The Buddha spoke to me saying: “Just so, Kāśyapa. I am your teacher, you are my disciple. Kāśyapa, now you have perfected your truly pure mind in this way, and you are one to be respected. One who does not know but says he knows, who does not see but says he sees, who is not truly an Arhat but says he is an Arhat, who is not a Complete and Perfect Buddha but says he is a Complete and Perfect Buddha, will naturally have his body¹ shattered into seven pieces. Kāśyapa, I, on the other hand, know, and therefore I say I know. I see and therefore I say I see. I am truly an Arhat and say I am an Arhat. I am truly a Complete and Perfect Buddha and say I am a Complete and Perfect Buddha. Kāśyapa, because I have a reason I now preach the Teaching for the auditors, not because I do not have a reason. I am the refuge, not without a refuge. I have supernatural powers, I am not without supernatural powers. Therefore, Kāśyapa, if one wants to hear the Teaching he should practice in this manner. If one wants to hear the Teaching and benefit others with it he should make his mind single pointed, be respectful and reverent, concentrated, listen attentively, and consider: I should correctly view the production and destruction of the five aggregates, the six domains of cognition, the [twelve] sense spheres, arising and destruction. I should dwell easily in the four bases of mindfulness with correct notions. I should cultivate the seven limbs of awakening and the eight liberations. I should truly realize my body, and always be mindful of that body. I have not yet realized the cutting off [of lust], and I am yet distant from feeling no shame and modesty. I should practice the practice of purity in order to attain the great merit attained by the great teacher, and I should always dwell in shame and modesty. I should practice in this manner.”

At that time the Blessed One preached the Teaching to me, revealed the teaching, inspired me and pleased me, and having revealed the teaching, inspired me and pleased me he got up and left. I also went following him toward his dwelling place. I took my *saṅghāṭī* robe made from rent fabric worth a hundred thousand pieces of gold, and folding it in four I sat down.

At that time the Blessed One knew my mind, everywhere I had gone

¹ T. 100 and Pāli have the more regular “head.”

(?).¹ I then spread out the robe as a sitting mat and asked the Buddha to sit down, and the Blessed One then sat. He stroked the robe with his hand and said, in praise: “Kāśyapa, this robe is light and fine, this robe is soft and supple.” I then said: “Just so, Blessed One. This robe is light and fine, this robe is soft and supple. I really wish the Blessed One would accept this robe of mine.”

The Buddha said: “Kāśyapa, you should accept my refuse rag robe, and I will accept your *saṅghāṭī*.” The Buddha then gave me his refuse rag robe with his own hands, and I presented my *saṅghāṭī* to the Buddha.

The same story, although arranged in a considerably different way, appears also in the **Vinayamāṭṭrikā*,² but the story of the robe does not appear until later in the relationship of Mahākāśyapa and the Buddha; the Buddha praises the robe of Kāśyapa, and the latter offers it to him.³ The Buddha then asks Kāśyapa what he wants in return, and the latter asks for the “**kāśika* grass (? 迦尸迦草) *pāṃsukūla* robe,” a choice of which the Buddha approves. Yet another version, also in Pāli, is found in the commentary to the *Theragāthā*. We read:⁴

The Elder (Mahākassapa), knowing that the Teacher wanted to sit down, folded into four the cloth robe he himself was wearing and spread it out. The Teacher sat there, and stroking the robe with his hand said “this cloth robe of yours is soft, Kassapa.” The Elder said: “Teacher, my robe is indeed soft,” and knowing that he would want to put it on said: “Reverend,

¹ I do not understand 處處下道 at T. 99 (II) 303b24, equivalent to 出道而住 at T. 100 (II) 418c6.

² T 1463 (XXIV) 803c8ff.

³ This episode is found narrated at 805a6-16.

⁴ *Paramatthadīpani Theragāthā-Atṭhakathā* ad Thag verses 1051-90. The crucial episode quoted here is found at Woodward 1959: iii.134,31-135,8: *thero nisīditukāmo satthā ti ñatvā attano pārupitaṃ paṭipilotikasaṅghāṭiṃ catugguṇaṃ katvā paññāpesi. satthā tattha nisīditvā hatthena cīvaraṃ parimajjanto mudukā kho tyāyaṃ kassapa paṭipilotikasaṅghāṭi ti āha. thero satthā mama saṅghāṭiyā mudubhāvaṃ katheti. pārupitukāmo bhavissati ti ñatvā pārupatu bhante bhagavā saṅghāṭin ti āha. tvaṃ kiṃ pārupissasi kassapā ti. tumhākaṃ nivāsanaṃ labhanto pārupissāmi bhante ti. kiṃ pana tvaṃ kassapa imaṃ paribhogajīṇṇaṃ paṃsukūlaṃ dhāretuṃ sakkhissasi. mayā hi imassa paṃsukūlassa gahitadivase udakapariyantaṃ katvā mahāpathavī kampi. imaṃ buddhānaṃ paribhogajīṇṇacīvaraṃ nāma na sakkā parittaguṇena dhāretuṃ. paṭibalen’ ev’ idaṃ paṭipattipūraṇasamatthena jātipaṃsukūlikena gahetuṃ vaṭṭati ti vatvā therena saddhiṃ cīvaraṃ parivattesi.*

the Blessed One should put on this robe.”

“What will you wear, Kassapa?” he said.

“I will get your clothing and wear that, Reverend.”

“Will you be able to carry this old, used rag robe? On the day I obtained this rag robe, the entire earth shook up to the encircling boundary of the oceans. It is not possible to carry this old, worn robe of the Buddha with only a small amount of merit. Only one with strength equal to the task, capable of fully carrying out correct practice, a pure wearer of rag robes, should take hold of it,” and so saying he passed the robe over to the Elder.

Very similar to this is the account in the **Abhinīṣkramaṇasūtra*, which also makes a point of having the Buddha ask Kāśyapa whether he is able to wear the *pāṃśu-kūla* robes. In telling the story, the Buddha makes a point of extolling the virtues of Kāśyapa, and says: “You monks, if you want to know who is my auditor, my disciple, of few wishes and easily satisfied, who practices the dhuta ascetic purification practices fully and completely — this is the monk the Reverend Mahākāśyapa.”¹ It is very likely, by the way, that we should recognize here an interesting dynamic of purity and spiritual power. As a monk or applicant for ordination, Kāśyapa should not wear fancy robes, indeed should not wear anything but the plainest robes. At the same time, the Buddha, whose spiritual and purificatory power is great, is able to break his own rules and wear such robes, without falling under their potentially corrupting influence. This is a common pattern, in fact: that the Buddha is often able to do things that other monks cannot, and is not bound by the rules that he lays down to bind his disciples, because of his superior attainments.² On the other hand, the *Theragāthā* commentary and the **Abhinīṣkramaṇasūtra* make a point of glorifying Kāśyapa as well. The rag robes of the

¹ T. 190 (III) 866c10-867a3. The portion translated is 866c29-867a3.

² Anyway, this is the apologetic explanation for the distinction. There are no doubt other varieties of explanation for this distinction, such as political and economic ones; this is a topic to which I plan to return at a later date.

Buddha are, as it were, imbued with his own charisma and power, and it is only Kāśyapa's own spiritual strength which allows him to wear these robes which, it is explained, one with a small amount of merit and so on would not be able to do.

The *Ratnarāśi* VIII.18 contains an allusion to this story of the exchange of robes between Śākyamuni and Kāśyapa. But while the story in the *Ratnarāśi* accounts for the source of the robe which Kāśyapa then is able to pass on to Maitreya in harmony with the texts cited above, a sign of the diversity of the tradition is that there does exist at least one other version, in which Kāśyapa passes on to Maitreya a robe he received from the Buddha on the latter's death bed.¹ This tradition appears to be separate from that with which the *Ratnarāśi* should be connected.

The story of Kāśyapa's acquisition of Śākyamuni's rag robes is important not only because it serves to certify the legitimate origins of the robe which Kāśyapa will later on pass on to Maitreya, but also because it is a symbol for the ascetic life of Kāśyapa himself. It is significant here, then, that it is a rag robe, a *pāṃśukūla*, that Kāśyapa obtains in trade from the Buddha.

This argument, however, is complicated by the fact that this is not the only tradition about the robe. Lacking any good idea of even relative chronologies for most of our source materials, we are reduced in some cases to simply cataloging the data, but certain patterns do seem to emerge out of the chaos.

Canonical Buddhist literature contains a well-known story of the Buddha's aunt and foster mother, Mahāprajāpatī, attempting to present a set of new, fine clothes to the

¹ The passage is in the 彌勒大成佛經 T. 456 (XIV) 433b19-22: "[Kāśyapa] will take Śākyamuni Buddha's *saṃghāṭī* and give it to Maitreya, saying: The great teacher Śākyamuni, the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksambuddha conferred this upon me at the time of his final nirvāṇa, commanding me to give it to the Blessed One [you, Maitreya]." (This passage was also translated by Kaikyoku Watanabe in Leumann 1919: 276, and Lamotte *Traité* [1944-80]: 191 note 1). Note that this story involves a contradiction with the general account of the Buddha's nirvāṇa, in which Kāśyapa is late arriving at the funeral. He would, therefore, have had no chance to obtain anything from the Buddha directly, although as mentioned above, he presumably does inherit the Buddha's belongings.

Buddha. The Chinese versions of this story label the robe a golden garment.¹ In the canonical accounts the Buddha refuses to accept the robes personally, and suggests to Mahāprajāpatī that she donate them to the community instead, but the tension is left unresolved.² Other texts, of uncertain but undoubtedly later date, continue the story, but the conclusion contains a twist: Mahāprajāpatī wanders into the assembly looking for a monk to accept the robes, and all refuse — except Maitreya.³ This version, of course, which omits Kāśyapa completely, provides a direct link between Śākyamuni and Maitreya. This may be based, at least in part, on the version in the *Pūrvāparāntaka-sūtra* of the *Madhyamāgama*, in which the Buddha directly hands over to Maitreya the golden robe received from Mahāprajāpatī — but notice that he asks Ānanda to fetch and give it to him first.⁴ Similarly so based is the account in the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*.⁵

A radically different resolution is provided by Xuanzang, who may have conflated various stories, or may have known a version which had attempted to synthesize several apparently disparate traditions. In Xuanzang's version, the Buddha gives to Kāśyapa the

¹ The *locus classicus* is found in MN iii.253,4 et seq. (sutta 142, *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅgasutta*). In Chinese the text is found in the *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 (180 瞿曇彌經) (I) 721c25ff. 新金縷黃色衣, and 分別布施經 T. 84 (I) 903b29ff. 新髻衣. See also the Mahiśāsaka Vinaya T. 1421 (XXII) 185b19ff., and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya *Kṣudrakavastu* T. 1451 (XXIV) 391b20-21 and following, where the term is 上新細縷黃金色罽.

² In T. 212 (IV) 691b14-16, the Buddha makes the explicit statement to Mahāprajāpatī that the robes are not to be presented to him alone since he is just one member of the whole community 夫欲施者當詣大眾。何爲獨向我耶。吾亦是大眾之一數。 According to Tomomatsu 1932: 104, this is an indication of Mahiśāsaka influence.

³ This is the resolution in the so-called *Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool* 賢愚經 T. 202 (57) (IV) 434a6-25, and in the 雜寶藏經 T. 203 (50) (IV) 470a15-22. See Demieville 1920: 164, Lévi 1932: 363 for a summary of the former, and Chavannes 1911: III.46 for a translation of the latter, on which see also Kagawa 1963: 119-22. The close connection between the two versions was noted by Lévi 1932: 365, and Kagawa 1963: 222. The Pāli *Anāgatavarisa Aṭṭhakathā*, attributed to one Upatissa, names Ajita as the recipient. See Lévi 1932: 365-66, and Jaini 1988: 62-63. There has been considerable discussion concerning the relation between Ajita and Maitreya, but for our purposes they may be treated as equivalent. See Filliozat 1950, and Kagawa 1963: 232-36.

⁴ T. 26 (66 說本經) (I) 511b1-5 = 古來世時經 T. 44 (I) 830b26-29. On this version see Demieville 1919: 162-63, Lévi 1932: 361-63, and Lamotte 1958: 780.

⁵ *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* T. 1545 (XXVII) 894a17-28. Sakurabe 1965: 42 notes that although the text is quoted at length the sūtra name is not given.

golden robe presented to him by Mahāprajāpatī, and this is the robe that Kāśyapa presents to Maitreya.¹

The *Ekottarāgama* presents yet another variation. It begins with the same text as the *Samyutta Nikāya sutta* referred to above, in which Kāśyapa insists on following the strict practices to which he has become accustomed, but it then continues differently.

Here both Kāśyapa and Ānanda are charged with preserving the teaching:²

“Kāśyapa, you should know that after my nirvāṇa, in a thousand years plus, there will be monks who retreat from the practice of concentration, who will not carry out the dhuta ascetic purification practices, will not beg for food or wear the rag robes. They will accept invitations from householders, and accept robes and meals from them. They will not dwell beneath trees or live out in the open, but will delight in ornamented residences. They will not use urine and feces as medicines, but will only use other medicinal herbs and extremely sweet things. Some among them will be greedy for material goods but will be stingy in their residences, and will quarrel among themselves.

At that time, donors and benefactors with deep faith in the teaching of the Buddha will delight in charity attaching no importance to material goods. After the death of that donor or benefactor he will attain rebirth in heaven, but those monks through their indolence will, upon death, fall into hell. Just so, Kāśyapa, all aggregates are impermanent and do not last long.

“Again, Kāśyapa, in a future generation there will be monks who shave their hair and beards but nevertheless practice the activities of the home. On the left they grasp at boys, on the right they grasp at girls. With flute and lute they beg for alms in the cities and villages. [Even] at that time the donors and benefactors will receive merit without limit. How much

¹ The relevant passage is in Xuanzang's *Datang Xiyu ji* 大唐西域記 (T. 2087 [LI] 919b29-c21 = Ji 1985: 705-06, translated in Beal 1906: II.143-44, Watters 1915: II.143-46, Mizutani 1988: 214). The difference from the other versions was pointed out by Lamotte 1944-80: 193, note 1, and the same apparent contradiction had been noticed by Watters 1915: II.145. Notice that this version is also in conflict with the accounts of Mahāprajāpatī's gift, for I know of no version in which Śākyamuni himself actually accepts the proffered robes.

² The whole text is T. 125 (35.5) (II) 746a21-c24, and the portion translated here is 746b9-c24.

more so today with genuine alms beggars? Just so, Kāśyapa, all aggregates are impermanent and do not last long.

“Kāśyapa, in a future generation there will be śramaṇa monks who will reject the eight-fold path and the seven limbs of awakening (?). The jewel of the teaching which I have accumulated over three immeasurable aeons of practice will be to those future monks as a song. Among that group of people they beg for alms to preserve their lives. But those donors and benefactors feed that group of monks, and still they obtain merit from that. How would they not receive merit [for feeding monks] today? Now I take this teaching and confer it upon the monks Kāśyapa and Ānanda. It is so. Now I am old and facing my eightieth year. It will not be long before the Tathāgata enters nirvāṇa. So now I take the jewel of the teaching and confer it upon these two people. They should memorize it well, recite it and hold it without flagging, spreading it to the world. Those who would intercept and stop the preaching of the sages shall quickly be sent to the border regions.¹ Therefore today I transmit to you the teachings of the sūtras; do not allow them to perish!”

At that time Mahākāśyapa and Ānanda got up from their seats and making a long bow and joining their hands together spoke to the Blessed One: “Why is this teaching of the sūtras transmitted to two people, and not transmitted to other people? Among the Tathāgata's contingent there are disciples with supernatural powers beyond calculation. Still, you do not transmit the teaching to them.”

The Blessed One said to Kāśyapa: “I cannot see among the gods and men individuals equally as able to receive and uphold this jewel of the teaching as are Kāśyapa and Ānanda. Neither are there any among the auditors. In the past, buddhas also had two people to receive and uphold the sūtras and teachings, but it was exceedingly rare that they were as great as the present day monks Kāśyapa and Ānanda. The monks who practiced the dhuta ascetic purification practices under past buddhas existed as long as the teaching existed, and perished when it perished. But now my monk Kāśyapa

¹
邊際。

I am not sure I have correctly understood this sentence at 746c2-3: 其有遇絕聖人言教者便爲墮

will stay long in the world. When Maitreya appears in the world, then he will pass into nirvāṇa. For this reason the present day monk Kāśyapa is superior to the groups of former monks. And why is the monk Ānanda superior to former attendants? In past times the attendants of all buddhas listened to what others said and then understood it. But these days the monk Ānanda already understands even before the Tathāgata speaks. Even what the Tathāgata does not say he knows thoroughly. For this reason the monk Ānanda is superior to the attendants of all former buddhas. Therefore, Kāśyapa and Ānanda, I now transmit to you, I pass on to you this jewel teaching. Do not allow it to perish!"

And at that time the Blessed One uttered a stanza:

All aggregates are impermanent.

They arise and must certainly perish.

What is free of birth is then free of death.

This extinction is the supreme happiness.¹

And then Kāśyapa and Ānanda having heard what the Buddha preached rejoiced and upheld the teaching.²

Finally, we may note that it may not even be necessary for the robe to be involved in the story at all. The **Abhiniṣkramaṇa-sūtra* and the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* contain the same episode, but it is only Kāśyapa's relics (*śarīra*) or skeleton which remain, undisturbed and clothed in the *saṃghāṭī*.³ One further step is taken by the

¹ The verse is the first true verse of the *Udānavarga* (the two previous verses are verses of homage): Uv 1.3. It is also found in GDhp 181 and numerous other places. In Sanskrit the verse reads: *anityā bata saṃskārā utpādayayadharmiṇaḥ / utpadya hi nirudhyante teṣāṃ vyupaśamaḥ sukham //*. Mizuno 1993: 34-35 lists 46 occurrences of this verse in Indic and Chinese language Indian texts.

² We may note, for what it is worth, that traditional sources, representing of course ideology rather than history, but for that no less interesting or important, maintain that relations between Ānanda and Mahākāśyapa were not good. This issue has been studied, although with a certain historical credulity, by Hirakawa 1981: 150-57. He draws our attention to numerous passages in which Kāśyapa frankly states his sever criticism of Ānanda.

³ **Abhiniṣkramaṇa-sūtra* T. 190 (III) 870a24-b25. This is the text studied by Beal 1875, but he has not translated the episodes of Kāśyapa and his robe. See pages 318-20. See also the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* T. 1509 (XXV) 78c27-79a16 and following, translated in Lamotte 1944-80: 193-95. Some of the wording of the **Abhiniṣkramaṇa* seems to be very close to that of the *Divyāvadāna*. The **Abhiniṣkramaṇa* passage was remarked by Sakurabe 1965: 39.

Divyāvadāna, borrowing directly from the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Here it is related only that it is Kāśyapa's skeleton which Maitreya encounters and reveals when he opens up the mountain in which Kāśyapa is interred, without any reference to the robe at all.¹ As Jaini has pointed out, "The *Divyāvadāna* story of the Tathāgata Maitreya's noble act of honoring the remains of the elder Kāśyapa was no doubt motivated by a desire to establish a physical connection, if not a direct line of transmission, between the Buddha of the present and the Buddha of the future."² I think exactly the same thing can be said of all the stories we have noticed here. It is another question, worth raising although we cannot answer it here, of whether there is some implication to be drawn from the coincidence of Kāśyapa's name with that of Kāśyapa Buddha, the most prominent of the buddhas of the past.

It is perhaps worthwhile noticing here that this approach to the stories of Kāśyapa, Mahāprajāpati and the robes of the Buddha might be treated from a number of different points of view, in addition to those we have chosen to emphasize here. Tomomatsu Entai has, in fact, devoted over two hundred pages of detailed discussion to the question of the economic implications of Mahāprajāpati's gift of robes, as interpreted in different strata of Buddhist literature.³ It is obviously beyond the scope of the present study to go into any detail on this matter, but it bears keeping in mind that Tomomatsu has made a convincing case for the hypothesis that the various different presentations of the same basic story reveal important aspects of the doctrinal positions of the texts and schools considered.⁴

¹ *Divyāvadāna* 61.22-29 (also printed in Leumann 1919: 174) = Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya *Bhaiṣajya-vastu* T. 1448 (XXIV) 25a25-b2. Virtually the same account is found in the 彌勒下生成佛經 T. 454 (XIV) 425c2-13. The latter is translated by K. Watanabe in Leumann 1919: 236.

² Jaini 1988: 75.

³ The Japanese half of Tomomatsu 1970 is entirely devoted to the question of Mahāprajāpati's gift of robes to the Buddha. The other half of the book is a reprint of Tomomatsu 1931 (in French).

⁴ Tomomatsu has, consequently, discussed virtually every source mentioned in the present discus-

The question we set out to ask here is why Kāśyapa may have been selected as the voice of the authors of certain early Mahāyāna texts, in other words, as the voice of our “imagined communities” of an early Mahāyāna. And one of the answers I have proposed is that what Kāśyapa’s presence provides, in addition to asceticism and a strictly pure monastic vision, is continuity. Buddhist notions of history and what is important historically have been discussed by scholars rather frequently of late, and one thing at least is clear. Linear history of the type to which we are accustomed is not as important, generally speaking, as the passage of cosmic, spiritual time. And in this way of thinking, ages meet and are linked with ages, past and future are joined, often toward the end of emphasizing some or another aspect of Buddhist doctrine or ideology. Among the most important of such connections is that between the present age of the Buddha Śākyamuni and the future dispensation of the Buddha Maitreya. Maitreya, who will in the future become a Buddha, after an indeterminate time (although specific numbers of years are assigned by various traditions), is nevertheless immanent even now as a bodhisattva. It is this of course which links him with Śākyamuni, in one sense. But the tradition also provides another means of linking the teaching of the Buddha Śākyamuni with that of the future Buddha. The agent of that connection is Kāśyapa, and the medium is the robe of Śākyamuni.

It would of course be possible to think of the age of Maitreya only in terms of a time which remains future for us today, a “messianic” age still to come.¹ And indeed this is the prevalent interpretation of the Maitreya story (or myth, or legend) among Buddhists themselves of almost every age and place. But indeed, the story raises some

sion, but I have not given reference to his discussions individually. The reader interested in the topic is advised to read Tomomastu’s whole book, since all of it is relevant to the present subject.

¹ I am aware that the use of the term “messianic” in the context of Maitreya may not be entirely appropriate, at least as far as the Indian Maitreya is concerned. But for a general discussion I think it will not be misleading and, in any case, one could make a very strong case that in East Asia at least the term is perfectly applicable.

interesting possibilities, one of which I would like to consider here.

We can speculate: When the early Mahāyānists first began to be aware of their teaching as a revision, even a reactionary revision, of the teachings of their contemporary coreligionists, they may have felt the necessity, not only doctrinally, but also historically, legendarily and mythically, to link their teachings with those of the universally acknowledged authentic, legitimate Buddha, Śākyamuni. One method they may have chosen, I would suggest, is to employ the myth of the disciple Kāśyapa. Not only does Kāśyapa represent anti-laxist tendencies within the monastic community by virtue of his status as first among the upholders of the dhuta ascetic purification practices, but he is also the bearer of the Buddha's imprimatur. It is he who is carrying the pith of the teaching to the future buddha, Maitreya.¹ It is through the medium of Kāśyapa that Śākyamuni is made to confer legitimacy on Maitreya and on future preachings of the Buddhist Dharma. It is, in a word, Kāśyapa who is the proxy guarantor — a proxy for Śākyamuni himself — of the orthodoxy and orthopraxy of the post-Śākyamuni Buddhist teaching. And by invoking Kāśyapa, the authors of those Mahāyāna texts in which he appears may have been trying to avail themselves of his aura of orthodoxy and authenticity.² The teachings taught to Kāśyapa are those the Buddha intended for the future age, we might suggest. They are the “new dispensation,” to borrow Conze’s expression.

It is in light of this reasoning that I offer the hypothesis that Kāśyapa appears as the Buddha’s interlocutor in various Mahāyāna sūtras as a means of invoking the legitimizing charisma of a history and legend well established in Buddhist lore, and widely

¹ I do not disregard the fact that the legends equally record Kāśyapa as “transmitting the Law” to Ānanda, his living successor, but I think the two legends are not mutually exclusive. They refer to two distinct levels of discourse, or two different “histories.”

² To be sure, there are certainly other modes through which Mahāyāna scriptures trace their legitimating lineages. One brings to mind immediately the legend of Nāgārjuna obtaining the Prajñāpāramitā scriptures from the Nāga kingdom, and the appeal to the authenticating witness of the buddha Prabhūtaratna in the opening passages of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*.

understood to symbolize purity in practice, on the one hand, and a link with the future on the other. The authors of the Mahāyāna texts provided a legitimating context for their statements by putting them into the mouth (or the ears) of Kāśyapa, the strict follower of the dhuta ascetic purification practices and the Buddha's hand picked heir.

The *Ratnarāśi* itself goes into detail on only one of the features just discussed, namely the importance of refuse rag robes. It is to an examination of these that we now turn.

Chapter 3

Rags are Riches

There can be little question that the whole topic of clothing is one of central importance in many Indian religions, particularly the so-called śramaṇic religions. Among the Jainas, of course, the fundamental distinction between the two main “sects,” the Digambaras and the Śvetāmbaras, at least on the surface, centers around their attitude toward the wearing of clothing.¹ And even in Buddhism, the very question of the appropriate color of the monastic robes was enough to engender considerable discussion, these colorings too apparently indicating sectarian identifications.² Again, the distribution of clothing in the monastic context served in some sense as a paradigm for the distribution of other types of possessions, and is treated in detail in the Vinaya texts.³

While there are, of course, numberless practical details that must be regulated in an actual monastic situation, what we find in a text like the *Ratnarāśi* is rather a symbolization of the robes, a treatment of the robes as what Carrithers has called an “emblem.” Referring to the whole set of four “requisites” (*nissaya*), Carrithers has suggested that they are “emblematic” in that

they became a way of representing both the seriousness of the meditator's purpose, and his separation from society and the rest of the Sangha. Inher-

¹ This is, needless to say, a vast generalization, and ignores the myriad other factors differentiating the sects. On the other hand, I think it points quite legitimately to the central and crucial role of clothing in Jainism in general. See Deo 1956: 160-45, 257-63. See also Prasad 1972: 129-40. For an accessible discussion of the differences and similarities between Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras, see Dundas 1992: 40-52.

² On this see Hirakawa 1972, and the exhaustive discussion in Satō 1963: 665-778. I do not know if this issue has been discussed in any European language.

³ On this see Chang 1957.

ent in this is the possibility that the emblems of asceticism could become ends in themselves, taking on a disproportionate significance; or that they could even be manipulated.¹

Whether or not the monastic robes may be said to have taken on “disproportionate significance” in the *Ratnarāṣi* would no doubt depend upon one’s idea of their proper significance. It is nevertheless true that the monastic robes are treated in our text with a level of attention not common in other scriptures belonging to the same general genre. It will be one of the goals of this chapter to study why this is so, and what it means.

To begin with, we must note that we are dealing here not only with the monastic robes per se, but with the most common, or we may say humble, form of robes, the so-called refuse rag robes. These are treated in Buddhist lore in general and the *Ratnarāṣi* in particular as one member of a set of, as mentioned above, “requisites,” of the monastic life. The *nissayas* (Sanskrit *nīśraya*) are the fundamental “items” a monk needs for his life. They are: a tree to sleep under (*vrkṣamūla*), alms food upon which to subsist (*piṇḍapāta*), rag robes with which to cover himself (*pāmsukūla*), and fermented cow’s urine for medicine (*pūtimukta*).² It is no accident that these items are also included in the dhuta ascetic purification practices (*dhūtaguṇa*), a list of generally speaking twelve or thirteen practices (ordered differently according to source) held to be particularly ascetic in nature.³ It is also, one is led to suspect, no accident that chapters five, six and seven of the *Ratnarāṣi* deal with the wilderness dweller (*āranyaka*, symbolically equivalent to the practice of sleeping outdoors under a tree), the alms begging monk, and the refuse rag monk. In other words, the very structure of the second half of the *Ratnarāṣi* directly reflects these categories of ascetic practice. We will return below to the meaning of all of

¹ Carrithers 1983: 60.

² I list these in the order of the Mhy. 8669-73.

³ See Miyamoto 1954: 302-10, and especially the chart on 304 for the ordering of the items in different sources.

this, but let us first take a closer look at these practices, one by one.

Various scholars have offered opinions on what is certainly one of the most important clothing customs in Buddhism, the wearing of so-called rag robes (*pāṃsukūla*).¹ We may refer to just a few. Lin Li-kouang thought that “Perhaps one must admit that the *pāṃsukūla* was actually, originally, the normal clothing of the buddhist priests, but at the time of the establishment of the canonical tradition it had been supplanted by the *kāśāya* as the stipulated clothing of monks and continued as no more than a special designation. Perhaps it was only, since the beginning, a special garment reserved for specialists in asceticism.”² In the same vein, but with a bit more supportive reasoning, Jean Przyluski suggested that the obligation to use *pāṃsukūla* is primitive in Buddhism, because it is contradictory to the custom, surely very ancient he believed, of offering clothing to the monks.³ He further suggested that in the early days monks wore simple *śāṇa* robes, but later after it became the custom to offer to monks fine robes the wearing of the *śāṇa* became a mark of saintliness or austerity.⁴ Przyluski speculated as follows: The authorization to gather pieces of material from around graves comes no doubt in attenuation of a more severe injunction which prescribed that one only gather fabric actually found on graves. The first *pāṃsukūla*, then, were actual shrouds. Later, the meaning of the word was enlarged and it was admitted that every piece of material found on a rag heap or simply piled on the ground was a *pāṃsukūla* and could, consequently, be utilized by a monk. From that point on, a layman could easily give a robe to the monastic community: it was enough to throw it on the ground in an area where monks would pass by. Certain donors took the precaution of having these abandoned objects guarded by

¹ A brief outline of what some Pāli and Chinese sources say about the rag robes, mostly in the way of defining what is to be so considered, may be found in Abe 1985.

² Lin 1949: 87.

³ Przyluski 1918-20: 104 = 367.

⁴ Przyluski 1918-20: 109 = 372.

servants to avoid having them taken by others than those for whom they were intended.¹

While the problem of the history of rag robes is no doubt a question of great interest for the history of Buddhism in India and even beyond, the so-called primitive history of the garments is of less interest to us now than is the ideology and the ideological context within which they were thought of by the authors of the early Mahāyāna sūtras. The *Ratnarāśi* devotes an entire chapter to the issue of rag robes and the wearing of rag robes, and also alludes to their importance elsewhere. We have already encountered one such discussion when we examined the legitimization myth of Kāśyapa and his connection with Maitreya. In that context we recalled the Buddha's utilization of the robe as an emblem to signify his certification of Kāśyapa as one of his heirs, and also to signify his certification of the teaching of the future buddha, Maitreya, as authentic and guaranteed.

Let us now look at another episode that the *Ratnarāśi* employs to lend glory and status to the robes (*Ratnarāśi* VII.11-13). This is the story of the humble novice Cunda and his visit to lake Anavatapta. In that story the fact of Cunda's distant connection with the Buddha is enough to ennoble him, in the eyes of the gods who protect the lake, over non-Buddhist ascetics. At least this is the main emphasis of the story in what seems to be its original context. There are similar versions of this story in various Buddhist texts, but let us refer first of all to the *Dīvyāvadāna*'s version in Sanskrit:²

¹ Przyłuski 1918-20: 114 = 377.

² Edition Cowell and Neil 1886: 152.22-153.20 (XII *Prātihāryasūtra*): *tena khalu samayena subhadro nāma parivrājakaḥ pañcābhijñāḥ / tasya kuśinagaryām āvasatho 'navatapte mahāsarasi divā vihāraḥ / atha raktākṣaḥ parivrājako yena subhadraḥ parivrājakas tenopasaṃkrāntaḥ / upasaṃkramyaitat prakaraṇam vistareṇārocayaty evaṃ cāha / yat khalu subhadra jāñyāḥ śramaṇo gautamo 'smābhīḥ rddhyā āhūtaḥ / sa kathayati / itaḥ saptame divase uttare manuṣyadharme riddhiprātihāryam vidarśa-yiṣyāmīti / nūnam śramaṇo gautamaḥ pakṣaparyeṣaṇam kartukāmaḥ tvayā sabrahmacāriṇām sāhāyiam karaṇīyam saptame divase tvayā śrāvastīm āgantavyam / subhadreṇābhīhitam / na śobhanam bhavadbhīḥ kṛtaṃ yad yuṣmābhīḥ śramaṇo gautamo riddhyā āhūtaḥ / tat kasya hetoḥ / mama tāvat kuśinagaryām āvāso 'navatapte mahāsarasi divā vihāraḥ / śramaṇasya gautamasya śāriputro nāma śiṣyas tasya cundo nāma śramaṇerakas tasyāpi tatraivānavatapte mahāsarasi divā vihāraḥ / na tathānavataptakāyikā devatā*

At that time there was a renunciant named Subhadra, possessed of the five super-knowledges.¹ His residence was in Kuśinagara, and he passed his days at the great lake Anavatapta.²

Then the renunciant Raktākṣa came to the place where the renunciant Subhadra was, and told him the situation [as previously discussed] in detail, speaking as follows: “You must know, Subhadra, that we have provoked the śramaṇa Gautama to use his magical powers. He said: ‘On the seventh day from now I will make a magical display of supernatural powers superior to those of men.’ The śramaṇa Gautama definitely wants to seek allies for himself [during this week]. You must join in friendship with your fellow ascetics, and in seven days time you must go to Śrāvastī.”

Subhadra said: “What you have done is not clever, namely that you have provoked the śramaṇa Gautama to use his magical powers. Why? First of all, my dwelling is in Kuśinagara, and I pass my days at the great lake Anavatapta. [Now,] the śramaṇa Gautama has a disciple (śiṣya) named Śāriputra, and he has a novice (śrāmaṇeraka) named Cunda. He too spends his days at that every same place, the great lake Anavatapta. The gods attached to Anavatapta do not consider that they must do homage to me as to him.

“Once upon a time, after having gone to Kuśinagara to beg alms I went to the great lake Anavatapta with those alms. But the gods attached to Anavatapta drew [all the] water from the great lake Anavatapta and did not give any to me. Cunda, instructed by his teacher, also went with his rag-

*api kārāṇ kartavyān manyate yathā tasya / eko 'yaṁ samaya ihāhaṁ kuśinagarīm piṇḍāya caritvā
piṇḍapātam ādāyānavataptaṁ mahāsarasaṁ gacchāmi / tasya mamānavataptakāyikā devatā 'navataptān
mahāsarasaṁ pānīyam uddhṛtyaikānte na prayacchati / cundaḥ śramaṇoddeśaḥ pāṁśukūlāny ādāyānava-
taptaṁ mahāsaro gacchati / tasyānavataptakāyikā devatā pāṁśukūlāni dhāvayitvā tena pānīyenātmānam
siñcati / yasya tāvad vyaṁ śiṣyapraṭiśiṣyakayāpi na tulyāḥ sa yuṣmābhir uttare manuṣyadharme riddhi-
prātihāryeṇāhūtaḥ / na śobhanam bhavadbhiḥ kṛtam yac chramaṇo gautamo riddhipraṭihāryeṇāhūtaḥ /
evam ahaṁ jāne yathā maharddhikaḥ śramaṇo gautamo mahānubhāva iti / raktākṣeṇābhīhitam / tvaṁ
tāvac chramaṇasya gautamasya pakṣaṁ vadasi tvayā tāvaṁ na gantavyam / subhadreṇābhīhitam / naiva
gamiṣyāmīti /*

The text is translated in Burnouf 1844: 173 = 1876: 154. I am grateful to my friend Hiraoka Satoshi, a specialist on the *Divyāvadāna*, for the comments he offered on my translation.

¹ According to Nakamura 1981: 371c, this refers to the common list of six superknowledges, minus the destruction of depravities (*āśravaṣṭayajñāna*). For more details see BHSD s.v. abhijñā.

² See Watters 1904: i.3335.

robes to the great lake Anavatapta. The gods attached to Anavatapta washed his rag-robes and anointed themselves with that water. So, you have provoked to use his magical powers, superior to those of men, one to whom you are not equal even to his disciple's disciple. ... etc."

The same passage is found in what is almost certainly the direct source of the *Divyāvadāna* story, the *Vinayaṣṣudrakavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.¹ Almost the identical story is again found in two versions of the *Sumāgadhāvadāna* in Chinese.² The first version is much abbreviated and does not mention the incident with the robe, but both versions mention that the gods did not permit Subhadra to approach the lake. The second clarifies that Cunda's robe is the blood-soaked clothing he took from a corpse in a tomb.³ While these would no doubt qualify as true "rag-robes," even in the hypothesized original sense of the term, such defiled objects would of course — Buddhist rhetoric notwithstanding — be extremely ritually impure.⁴ Some of the gods go so far as to drink the water which had been used for washing the robes, and the point is, obviously, that Cunda's purity and holiness are able to cleanse even such horrifically defiled items. Yet another version of the story is found in a Chinese translation of an *Udānavarga* commentary.⁵ In the latter account the robes hardly enter into the story at all.⁶

¹ T. 1451 (XXIV) 330a14-29, especially 25-28. On the relation between the *Divyāvadāna* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya see most recently, and with reference to previous studies, Hiraoka 1991.

² *Xumotinu-jing* 須摩提女經 T. 128 (II) (recension a) 836b19-26, and (recension b) 839a12-b16, translated, respectively, in Tokiwai 1898: 56 and 23-24. This is not found in the Sanskrit or Tibetan versions of the text in Iwamoto 1968, 1979.

³ 叉手淚塚間死人之衣血垢污染.

⁴ We notice an interesting confirmation of this view in the **Vinayamātrkā* T. 1463 (XXIV) 828b19-27. The Buddha at one time did not permit monks wearing the clothing of corpses to enter the stūpa 佛於一時不聽諸比丘着死屍衣入塔. The monks say "We all wear the pāṃśukūla. How can we not enter the stūpa and worship?" Then the Buddha informs the monks that they shall take those pāṃśukūla and soak them for a long while in water, using ash to wash them completely clean, and then fragrance them with incense. Then they may enter the stūpa.

⁵ The text is 出曜經, which according to its preface was translated from an Indic text around 398-99. See Maeda 1964: 708. The passage is T. 212 (IV) 658b3-19.

⁶ It is obvious as well that the story here, like virtually all stories in the various commentaries to the *Dharmapada* corpus, has been torn willy-nilly from any original context and made, usually on some

The point of these stories in general, in what is apparently their original context, is that Cunda, not even a direct disciple of the Buddha but rather a mere novice attached to a disciple, is treated with tremendous respect by the protector gods resident at lake Anavatapta, while Subhadra, a non-Buddhist but a full-fledged ascetic in his own right, in contrast is shunned. Truly, the texts are saying, the spiritual charisma of the Buddha is great. His power and influence, or even in a sense his protection, extends even to the disciple's disciple. The non-buddhist ascetic who challenges the Buddha is warned in this way of the power of his opponent. The story is about power, but it is the power of the Buddha, and not the power of the robes. From a rhetorical point of view, the message of the episode is the great glory and, again, power of the Buddha in contrast to that of other, competing, religious leaders or groups. The motif of the robes, while perhaps an important and even characteristic element in the story, is far from carrying either the main religious or rhetorical message of the episode. It is virtually an incidental ornament, a rhetorical device, a prop, and its work is to press home a point unrelated to the robes themselves.

The use to which the whole story is put in the *Ratnarāṣi*, on the other hand, is quite different, and the emphasis here *is* squarely on the robes themselves. It is, to be sure, not incidental that Subhadra is a non-Buddhist even in the *Ratnarāṣi*, but the story has been completely excised from its context, and there is no trace of any Buddhist — non-Buddhist debate. The point in the *Ratnarāṣi* is candidly the exaltation of the splendid qualities of refuse rag robes. The entire context of the episode has been ignored and a new one substituted. There can be little question, I think, that the original story,

extremely slender pretext, often the identity of a word or two, to serve as a justification for the utterance of some verse or verses. Here the justification has nothing to do with robes, but the "connection" seems rather to be the verse's statement that "this path is superior, this path is unexcelled," since the story has it that Cunda is treated better than Subhadra since Cunda's training in the eight-fold path is superior. (The verse nominally corresponds to Dhṛp 276, but actually it is only *cd* which correspond. I do not know an exact parallel to T. 212 [IV] 658a27-28.)

whether in one of the versions quoted above or not I cannot say, was known to the authors of the *Ratnarāśi*, and borrowed by them. In the process of this borrowing they shed the context, for which they had no use, and invented a new environment and, with it, a new message for the same narrative pericope. It is of course often the case that rather than any borrowing from one known source to another the explanation of a common, often pool, source is preferable. In the present case, however, a comparison of the *avadāna*-type context and its internal logic with the context and internal logic, such as it is, of the episode in the *Ratnarāśi* leads us to the conclusion that the authors of the *Ratnarāśi* knew and borrowed from a version similar to that quoted above from the *avadānas*.

In I.6 we find the following expression:

Kāśyapa, I stipulate that the monastic robe is for one without impurities, but, Kāśyapa, I say that all of those who, characterized by impurity, wear the pure monastic robes on their bodies burn the monastic robes, except for those earnest in their intention. Why? Because this is the banner of the Nobles. These garments, which belong to those who are repentant and practice free from passion, conform to their tranquility and are attendant upon their friendliness.

A passage in the Pāli Vinaya contains similar imagery, and relates that an evil monk (*pāpabhikkhu*) suffers as a result of his actions in the past because: his upper robe (*saṃghāṭī*), bowl (*patta*), waist-belt (*kāyabandha*) and body (*kāya*) are aflame, blazing, set afire (*āditta*, *sampajjalita*, *sajotibhūta*).¹ In the *Kāśyapaparivarta* one of two burning torments (*paridāgha*) of the renunciant (*pravrajita*) is “the wearing of the ochre robe by one characterized by impurity.”²

¹ Vinaya iii.107,22-28 = SN ii.260, 29-261,2 (XIX.17). The Chinese equivalent to the latter is *Samyuktāgama* T. 99 (530) (II) 138b17-27. There the evil monk is an administrative monk who abused his position for personal gain.

² KP §117: “These two, Kāśyapa, are burning torments for a renunciant. Which two? Namely, the wearing of the ochre robe by one characterized by impurity” *dvāv imau kāśyapa pravrajitasya*

The passage from the *Ratnarāṣi* is also interesting because it contains a very old and classical pun, on *kaṣāya*, “impurity,” and *kāṣāya*, “the ochre monastic robe.” The early poetry of Indian Buddhism also knows the conceit. We may refer to *Dhammapada* 9, and render:¹

Who will put on the ochre robe, being not free from impurity,
devoid of control and truth,² is not worthy of the ochre [robe].

Already in 1881 Max Müller, and apparently Fausbøll before him, noticed the pun, and a non-Buddhist parallel from the *Mahābhārata*, which Müller translates:³

Know that this yellow-coloured garment on a man who is not free
from impurity serves only for the purpose of cupidity; my opinion is, that it
is meant to supply the means of living to those shavelings, who carry their
virtue or the dharma like a flag.

The same pun is found also at in the *Kāśyapaparivarta* and in the *Ugradattapari-prcchā*,⁴ and is also said to occur in Jaina literature.⁵

It is probably not necessary to quote here all the passages in the *Ratnarāṣi* in which robes are mentioned or alluded to. What is interesting and worth mentioning here is that we can find several very interesting parallels to the *Ratnarāṣi* in related texts. First

paridāgho katamo dvau / yad uta sakaṣāyasya ca kāṣāyadhāraṇam

¹ Dhṛ 9 [= Jāt. ii.198,8-9; v.50,26; Thag 969] reads: *anikkasāvo kāsāvaṃ yo vatthaṃ paridahessati / apeto damasaccena na so kāsāvaṃ arahati //*, and Uv 29.7: *aniṣkaṣāyaḥ kāsāyaṃ yo vastraṃ paridhāsyati / apeta damasauratyo nāsau kāsāyaṃ arhati //*. Very similar are PtDhp 94 and GDhp 192. For the v = y equivalence, *kāsāva* = *kāṣāya*, see Geiger 1943 §46, Pischel 1981 §254, and v. Hinüber 1986 §214.

² Better: “gentleness.” *sacca* is probably an error in the tradition. GDhp has *soraca*, which supports the Sanskrit reading *sauratya* rather than **satya*.

³ *Mahābhārata* 12.18.33: *aniṣkaṣāye kāsāyaṃ ihārtham iti viddhi tat / dharmadhvajānām muṇḍānām vṛttyartham iti me matiḥ //*. Translated by Müller 1901: 6, in the note.

⁴ KP §117: *sakāṣāyasya ca kāṣāyadhāraṇam* = *rnyog pa dang bcas pa* ‘i *sems kyis ngur smrig* ‘*chang ba*, “the wearing of the ochre robe by one characterized by impurity,” or in the verse *sakaṣāya-cittasya kāṣāyadhāraṇam*, “by one with a mind characterized by impurity.” The *Ugra* is quoted at *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 136.6-7.

⁵ The same is said to occur in the Jaina *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra* Parva 1 sarga 6 śloka 1-52 (Nagarajaji p. 178), *Ādi-purāṇa* parva 18, *Āvaśyakasūtra-niryukti* Malayagiri vṛtti pp. 232.2-234.1. I regret I have been unable to locate these texts to check the references.

of all, let us take a look at the *Maitreyamahāsimhanādasūtra*.¹

“In a future time, Kāśyapa, in a future age, in the last five hundred years,² there will arise śramaṇas overcome by fame, śramaṇas by virtue of their figure, outward form, and distinguishing marks, not by virtue of their keeping the precepts (*śīla*), concentration (*samādhi*) or wisdom (*prajñā*). By way of example, Kāśyapa: a man might cast a spell on a garment with incantations and drugs and saturate it thoroughly. Then there are some people, and when one of them puts it on after seven or eight days, his body will be aflame and burning all over. That garment upon which a spell was cast with incantations and drugs and so thoroughly saturated, he gives in a friendly way to someone who is not a friend of his, and then that man too, knowing the garment to be a fine one, will take it and he too will put it on. And then for seven or eight days time he will experience pleasure from that garment, but after seven or eight days, when that man may be in his house or on a highway, that garment will begin to burn and then that man will experience disastrous sufferings on that account, and he will be burned and will die.

“What do you think, Kāśyapa? How much pleasure will there be from this robe, how much wretchedness?”

Kāśyapa said: “Blessed One. The pleasure will be small, but the wretchedness will be without measure.”

The Blessed One said: “In this way, Kāśyapa, those monastic robes of mine imbued with precepts, concentration, wisdom, liberation and the knowledge and vision of liberation have been perfected through use for innumerable billions of aeons. Those foolish people who resemble śramaṇas,³ putting on the banner of the ṛṣis might enter villages, towns, cities, urban centers and metropolises, and then brahmans and pious householders thinking them to be śramaṇas will honor them, revere them, venerate them and esteem them. They, receiving esteem on account of that [monastic robe] will experience pleasure. But when they die they will fall into hell and there

¹ See the end of this chapter for the text translated here.

² See Nattier 1991: 108 (115).

³ *śramaṇapratiṛūpaka*, Mhy 6689.

they will wear sheets of burning iron, eat iron balls, drink boiling liquid iron and lie down on top of burning beds.

“Although, Kāśyapa, on account of their own karma they will certainly go to hell at death, look at the glory and majesty of the monastic robes which cause even those foolish people to enjoy many kinds of things that bring happiness.¹ Thinking about that, Kāśyapa, I say: Wearing iron sheets is preferable to putting on the monastic robes while violating the precepts. Eating iron balls is preferable to enjoying alms while violating the precepts. In that regard, Kāśyapa, see how much pleasure there is from this robe, see how much wretchedness. Therefore, Kāśyapa, you should so learn the way such that by all means the precepts will be purified and sin destroyed.”

There is no question that in this as in numerous other passages, some quoted elsewhere in this study, the close relation between the *Ratnarāśi* and the *Maitreyamahā-simhanādasūtra* is evident. I would go so far as to suggest that we might posit a historical connection as well, but I am not able to prove that at the moment. Another text which in some ways shares much with the *Ratnarāśi* is the *Ratnamegha-sūtra*. And in the present case too we find several passages which seem to shed light on the *Ratnarāśi*'s own use of the imagery of the robe. In the following passage, the *Ratnamegha-sūtra* seems to offer an extension of the symbolism of the robes in the *Ratnarāśi*:²

“Gentle son. If they possess ten qualities, bodhisattvas are [true] wearers of refuse rags. What are the ten? They are those who: (1) Are firm

¹ I thank Prof. Nagao for helping me to understand the text here. The Chinese has: “You, Kāśyapa, see that the majesty and glory of the robes is like this: even those fools by putting on the robes could obtain pleasure and indulgence (*kausīdya*), but due to their evil karma, when they die they fall into hell.”

² The Tibetan is in *Derge* 231: *mdo sde*, wa 84a3-4; *Peking* 897: *mdo*, *dzu* 89b3-5:
rigs kyi bu chos bcu dang ldan na byang chub sems dpa' phyag dar khrod pa rnams yin no // bcu gang zhe na / 'di lta ste / (1) yang dag par blangs pa la bstan [D brtan] pa rnams yin / (2) sems dma' ba rnams yin / (3) yongs su mi skyo ba rnams yin / (4) de la ma zhen pa rnams yin / (5) nyes par lta ba dang bral ba rnams yin / (6) yon tan du lta ba rnams yin / (7) bdag la mi bston [D stod] ba rnams yin / (8) gzhan la mi smod pa rnams yin / (9) tshul khrims phun sum tshogs pa rnams yin / (10) lha 'du ba rnams yin no //.
 The same passage in Chinese is T. 489 (XIV) 737c5-9: 菩薩若修十種法者。常著糞掃衣。何等爲十。一者。堅固誓願。二者。謙下其心。三者。不生疲倦。四者。離諸有著。五者。不觀過失。六者。唯觀功德。七者。不自讚譽。八者。不毀謗他。九者。戒行具足。十者。聖賢親近。

in undertaking [their vows]; (2) Have humble minds; (3) Do not tire; (4) Are not attached; (5) Are free from noticing faults [in others]; (6) [Only] notice good qualities; (7) Do not praise themselves; (8) Do not disparage others; (9) Are perfect in [upholding] the precepts; (10) Associate with gods [Chin: nobles].

Again, another passage in the same text is in many respects very close to parts of the *Ratnarāṣi*.¹

Gentle son. If a bodhisattva is endowed with ten qualities, he is one who practices living on alms food (*paiṇḍapātika*). What are the ten? They are to be those who: 1) make an effort to benefit sentient beings [by gathering them into the teaching]; 2) beg alms in proper order; 3) are by nature free from exhaustion; 4) are satisfied [with what they receive]; 5) distribute [the alms to others]; 6) are not attached; 7) are moderate in the amount of alms they eat; 8) are favorably disposed toward the goal; 9) have completely amassed their roots of good; 10) are without any concern at all (for the body).

Gentle son. Now then, how is the bodhisattva one who makes an effort to benefit sentient beings — up to — one who is without any concern at all (for the body)? Gentle son. Now then, if a bodhisattva sees sentient beings suffering, with few roots of good, endowed with few roots of good, in order to benefit those sentient beings he undertakes the vows of the alms beggar. And when he enters a village, town or city in search of alms, he goes in search of alms mindfully and with correct deportment, his senses unwavering, his senses not wild, his senses controlled, gazing just a yoke's length ahead, mindful of good things. When he goes in search of alms he takes alms in strict order, and praising his impetus (?) he practices alms begging, not accepting (alms) exclusively from rich villages of prominent brahmans, great like sāla trees, or villages of prominent kṣatriyas, great like sāla trees, or villages of prominent householders, great like sāla trees, until the time when he will accomplish his goal (i.e., only until he gets enough for his daily meal).

¹

See the Textual Sources at the end of this Chapter for the text translated here.

However, in those places in which there are dog eaters, or just-born calves, or those beings belonging to the realm of beasts, bad by nature and by manner, where there are women, men, boys and girls who have the intention of joking around — setting completely aside all those low places, he goes begging in strict order, and without becoming exhausted, and undefiled, he produces no desire toward those sentient beings, nor does he produce any anger. And being unexhausted, he is satisfied by those poor alms he [receives] according to what he deserves. And taking those alms he goes back to his own dwelling, and having washed his alms bowl, robes and hands and feet he worships and makes devotion to the image of the Tathāgata and the stūpa of the Tathāgata.

And having wandered, and coming to his dwelling, from those alms he places one portion aside for his fellow practitioners. A second portion he places aside for those who are suffering. A third portion he places aside for those sentient beings who have fallen into unlucky existences. The fourth portion he himself eats. When he eats he is without lust, he does not desire [the food], he does not long for it, he is not greedy for it, but rather he eats only in order to maintain his body and for the sake of his life. He eats in such a way that his spirit will not become very low and his body will not become very heavy. Why? If his spirit become very low, he will turn his back on the side of good. If his body becomes very heavy, he will be overcome by sleep. After eating those alms, he should become favorably disposed toward the good, make an energetic effort, be without torpor, not be tired, and he should fully realize the factors leading to awakening. Having amassed the factors leading to awakening, he will not grasp at a self, and not grasping at a self even with his own flesh he works for the sake of sentient beings. Gentle son. If he is endowed with those ten qualities, the bodhisattva is one who practices living on alms food.

A further comparison may be made with a passage from the *Ugradattapari-prcchā*:¹

¹ Quoted at *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 136.1-7: *vasanopabhogaprayojanam ugradattapari-prcchāsūtre 'bhihitam / hrīrapatrāpyakaupīnaḥ pracchādanārtham tu śramaṇalingasaṃdarśanārtham imāni ca k[ā]ṣāyāṇi devamanuṣāsurasya lokasya caityam iti / caityārtham samyagdharmaṇi / nirvṛtivarāgaraktāni etāni / na*

A loin cloth is [worn] out of modesty and shame, but also for the sake of covering ones body¹ and displaying [to others] the distinctive marks of a śramaṇa. One should wear [the robes] properly because they are a shrine, thinking: ‘these ochre robes are a shrine for the world together with its gods, men and asuras.’ They are dyed in liberation and passionlessness [virāga], not dyed with passion.² They are conducive to calm, not defilement and passionate excitement. We will become turned away from sin by [wearing] these ochre robes. Those who perform good actions are not intent on the effort of adorning their robes, but thinking that these ochre robes are conducive to gathering the requisites of the Noble Path they resolve that they shall act in such a way as to never, even for a single instant, wear the ochre robes upon their bodies with [a mind stained by] impurity.

Another passage in the same text again stresses the honor due the robes, this time irrespective of the behavior of the wearer of those robes. We read:³

rāgaraktāni / upaśamānukūlāny etāni / na saṃkleśasamdhukṣaṇānukūlāni / ebhiś ca kāśāyair vivṛtapāpā bhaviṣyāmaḥ / sukṛtakarmakāriṇo na cīvaramaṇḍanānuyogam anuyuktāḥ / etāni ca kāśāyāṇy āryamārga-sambhārānukūlānīti kṛtvā tathā kariṣyāmo yathā naikakṣaṇam api sakaśāyāḥ kāye kāśāyāni dharaviṣyāma iti // The passage is quoted and translated in Mochizuki 1988: 273-5, with the Tibetan and Chinese versions also given. See for the *Ugra* in Tibetan Peking *dkon brtsegs, zhi*, 321b1-7 and in Chinese T. 310 (XI) 477b23-cl; T. 322 (XII) 19c16-23; T. 323 (XII) 27c24-28a3. For the first portion, which is a stock phrase, see the notes to the translation, VII.1. The passage is introduced with the sentence: “The purpose of the use of garments is set forth in the *Ugrapariṣṛcchāsūtra*.”

¹ Tibetan: to protect it from stinging insects and flies, wind, the sun and poisonous snakes.

² That is, also “red color,” a pun on *rāga*.

³ sTog 22b6-23b4, Peking 312b6-313b2: *khyim bdag gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' khyim pa khyim na gnas pas yan lag brgyad dang ldan pa'i bsnyen par gnas pa blang bar bya'o // des dge sbyong dang / bram ze tshul khrims dang ldan pa / yon tan dang ldan pa / dge ba'i chos dang ldan pa rnams la bsnyen par bya / bsten [P sten] par bya / bsnyen bkur bya'o // de dag la bsnyen cing bsten te / bsnyen bkur byed cing spyod pa 'khrul pa med pas [P par] rang gi nyes pa mthong bar bya'o // des dge sbyong gi spyod pa las nyams pa'i dge slong mthong na yang mi gus pa'i bag cung zad kyang mi bya ste / 'di ltar bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas rnyog pa med pa / nyon mongs pa'i rnyog pa thams cad dang bral ba de'i ngur smrig ni tshul khrims kyi yongs su bsgos pa / ting nge 'dzin dang / shes rab dang / rnam par grol ba dang / rnam par grol ba'i ye shes mthong bas yongs su bsgos pa 'di dag yin te / 'di ni 'phags pa rnams kyi drang srong gi rgyal mtshan yin no snyam du sems bskyed par bya'o //*

des de dag la rab tu gus pa bskyed nas / dge slong de la snying rje chen po bskyed [P skyed] par bya'o // sdig pa'i spyod pa 'di ni ma legs so // kun nas nyon mongs pa'i spyod pa 'di ni ma legs so // 'di ltar bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas dul ba / zhi ba / sbas pa / cang shes pa de'i drang srong gi rgyal mtshan bgos kyang 'di ni ma byang zhing ma zhi / ma sbas / ma dul ba ste / cang shes pa ma yin pa'i spyod pa spyod do // bcom ldan 'das des ma bslabs pa la ma brnyas shig ces gsungs pas na 'dis nyes pa ma yin gyi / nyon mongs pa gang gis mi dge ba 'di dag ston pa'i

Householder! Again, a householder bodhisattva¹ while still living in the home should undertake the eight-fold fast.² He should serve, worship and reverently honor monks and brāhmaṇas who are precept keeping (*śīlavat), virtuous and endowed with good qualities. And serving, worshipping and reverently honoring them, he should examine his own faults with undeviating (*avyabhicāra) proper behavior. Even if he sees a monk who acts contrary to the proper behavior of the śramaṇa, he should not be discourteous even in the slightest. He should think thus: “The ochre robes of the Blessed One, Tathāgata, Arhat, Complete and Perfect Buddha, free of turbidity and all the turbidities of defilements, are saturated with the precepts, saturated with concentration, wisdom, liberation, and the knowledge and vision of liberation; these are the nobles’ banner of the Rishis.”

Being respectful toward [the robes], he should be extremely compassionate toward that monk. [He should think:] “This evil behavior is not good. This defiled (*saṃkliṣṭa) behavior is not good.” Thus even though [that monk] puts on that banner of the rishis [fit for] a Blessed One, Tathāgata, Arhat, Complete and Perfect Buddha, restrained, pacified, guarded, noble, he behaves impurely, without peace, unguarded, unrestrained, without nobility. When the Blessed One said “Do not despise one who is not learned!” he meant that it is not that one sins, but rather it is the defilements which proclaim that these bad actions are due to some defilements that sin. Since the teaching of the Buddhas, Blessed Ones, will come true, when he understands and correctly cognizes these defilements he will attain the first fruit [of the path], and he will be fixed in the certainty (*niyāma) of attaining unexcelled perfect awakening. Why? Because the defilements are

nyon mongs pas nyes so // sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rnams kyi bstan pa ni 'byung ba dang bcas pa yin
pas gang nyon mongs pa 'di dag khong du chud nas tshul bzhin so sor rtog na / dang po'i 'bras bu thob par
'gyur te / de bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu nges par 'gyur ba'i gnas yod do // de ci'i
phyir zhe na / 'di ltar nyon mongs pa rnams ni ye shes kyis bsal ba yin pas na / bcom ldan 'das kyis kyang
gang zag gis gang zag la tshod gzung bar mi bya ste / gang zag gis gang zag la tshod bzung na nyams par
'gyur ro zhes gsungs pas / de bzhin gshegs pa ni rab tu mkhyen pa / bdag ni rab tu shes pa ma yin no snyam
nas / des dge slong de dag la gnod sems med pa dang / zhe sdang med pa dang / khong khro ba med pa
dang / khro ba med pa yang bskyed [P skyed] par bya'o //. The corresponding Chinese texts are found in T.
310 (XI) 476a3-17, T. 322 (XII) 19a1-15, T. 323 (XII) 26c13-27a3.

¹ *grhasthabodhisattva.

² *aṣṭāṅgasamanvāgam upavāsaṃ.

cleansed by wisdom. The Blessed One also said: “One person must not judge another person.¹ If one person judges another person, it is a sin.” And thinking “The Tathāgata knows; I do not know,” he should not think harmfully about those monks, nor have anger, hatred or spite.

In the **Daśabhūmivibhāṣa*, ten benefits (利) of wearing the robes are listed.²

One wears the robes:

1) out of modesty and shame; 2) to protect against cold, heat, stinging insects, flies and poisonous snakes; 3) to display the distinctive marks of the śramaṇa; 4) so that all gods and men, seeing the robe of the teaching, might honor and pay reverence to it like a stūpa or caitya; 5) so that one wears soiled robes with a mind of renunciation and does not lust for good things; 6) so that one pursues quiescence and does not inflame the defilements; 7) so that wearing the robes of the teachings one can easily notice when one sins; 8) so that wearing the robes of the teaching one does not seek further unnecessary ornamentation; 9) so that wearing the robes of the teaching one may pursue the cultivation of the eightfold noble path; 10) [thinking] “I should vigorously practice the path without a soiled mind, and should wear the ochre robe if even only for a short while.

It should be clear that, while this passage does not claim to be a quotation of or even based upon the *Ratnarāṣi*, it is fully in harmony with the approach of the latter. It would be possible no doubt to continue to collect passages from other texts which illustrate and shine light upon the robe imagery of the *Ratnarāṣi*. But rather than continue in that way, let us turn our attention to the other two practices advocated by our text, first wilderness dwelling, and then alms begging.

When we first begin to discuss “wilderness dwelling,” it is incumbent upon us to make some attempt to define our terms. What is a wilderness? The world in Vedic and

¹ Mhy. 7028: *mā pudgalaḥ pudgalaṃ pramaṇotu.*

² T. 1521 (XXVI)111c1-9: 一。以慚愧故。二。障寒熱蚊虻毒虫故。三。以表示沙門儀法故。四。一切天人見法衣恭敬尊貴如塔寺故。五。以厭離心著染衣非爲貪好故。六。以隨順寂滅非爲熾然煩惱故。七。著法衣有惡易見故。八。著法衣更不須餘物莊嚴故。九。著法衣隨順修八聖道故。十。我當精進行道不以染污心於須臾間著壞色衣。

Brahmanical India is divided, according to Charles Malmoud, into two: *aranya*, which is more or less “wilderness,” and *grāma*, “village.” The first and most fundamental thing we should remember in this regard is that, as Malmoud has observed, “In a general fashion ... the two zones, the forest and the village, are distinguished less by material traits than by the religious and social signification that one attributes to each of them.”¹ In this regard, the “forest,” *vana*, is a special case of the *aranya*, but in terms of their religious value (as opposed, for example, to their ecological signification), they overlap.² The “wilderness,” moreover, is not positively defined, but defined as a lack, an absence of village.³ Sprockhoff has offered an amazingly detailed study of the designations *āranyaka* and *vānaprastha* in the Vedic and Brahmanical literature, attempting to trace the exact nuances of the key terms including *aranya* and *vana*.⁴ It is fortunate that for our purposes here we do not have to digest all of Sprockhoff’s voluminous data, nor do we have to try and correlate his findings with the usages in our texts. It is enough for the present that we are aware of the nature of the contrast between wilderness and village as an *ideological* and not an *ecological* contrast.

The designation “wilderness dweller,” then, need not and almost certainly does not imply that the religious practitioner in question is actually living far away from and out of contact with a village and villagers. In fact, this would be impossible, because it is necessary that he be supported by the villagers. In this context, let me try to explain myself by using the concept of the “domestication” of the saṅgha introduced by Strenski and correlating it with the distinction offered by Olivelle between hermit and renouncer. Let me begin with Strenski.

¹ Malmoud 1976: 4. A somewhat different approach is taken by Zimmermann 1987.

² Malmoud 1976: 6.

³ Malmoud 1976: 11.

⁴ Sprockhoff 1981, 1984.

In his very interesting study, Strenski has offered a fairly theoretical argument that the nature of the gift relation between *saṅgha* and lay community implies domestication of the former. What does this mean?

Domestication of the *saṅgha* occurs whenever certain relations are established between the *saṅgha* and laity, whenever the *saṅgha* participates with the laity in institutions. We should therefore consider at least five salient areas of domesticating relationship: residential, ritual, social, political and economic. Thus when it is said that the *saṅgha* is 'domesticated' we should mean that it has established relationships with lay society in one or more of these five (or more) senses.¹

All of this takes place on the stage of giving. "Ritual giving," Strenski says, "sits squarely in the centre of the relation between the *saṅgha* and lay society. Giving defines the very relationship between the *saṅgha* and lay society: the monks are always receivers, the laity always givers."² He then defines his key terms.³ Restricted exchange is "a transaction [that] can be completed, it operates between two parties, and aims to achieve equilibrium." In contrast, generalized exchange

seeks an unbalanced condition between exchange partners, which requires repayment at some unspecified time, typically by another group or person than the original receiver of the first gift.... Pushed to its limit, generalized exchange approaches sacrifice, which I take to be outright giving in which no return is expected — partly because the gift is permanently alienated in some way, as by killing a victim, consuming it and so on.... Giving to the *saṅgha* ought to be interpreted much more as an instance of generalized exchange than restricted exchange (and also to some degree as sacrifice): what has been labelled 'domestication' of the *saṅgha* is no more than the condition of the *saṅgha* within a system of generalized exchange. 'Domestication' simply names a process of the *saṅgha*'s participation in a certain

¹ Strenski 1983: 464-65.

² Strenski 1983: 470.

³ Strenski 1983: 471-72. In the following I have expanded Strenski's abbreviations GX, RX, and SX without further note.

social solidarity. Thus, if gift-giving to the *sangha* in the spirit of generalized exchange is normal and natural to Buddhism, then so also is its consequent domestication.... Restricted exchange between the *sangha* and laity is problematic, primarily because the *bhikkhu* is supposed to be a paradigm of *non-reciprocity*. For this reason, restricted exchanges proceed in a Buddhist setting under what may seem unusual circumstances — almost as if reciprocity itself were at the same time being denied. For instance, restricted exchanges begin with a gift from a *dāyaka* to a monk or to the *sangha*. In return the *sangha* (or monk) seems to perform certain rituals for lay benefit, preach the *dhamma*, maintain a conspicuous exemplary standard of public moral purity, and make itself accessible as an occasion of merit-making.

No doubt such a scheme has a great many applications in the anthropological study of contemporary Buddhism and Buddhist societies, but here I would like to try and use it in a different way. First, however, I will introduce several ideas of Olivelle, and then try to coordinate the two schemes. In his very interesting study of Brahmanical asceticism, Patrick Olivelle introduces a distinction between hermits and renouncers. The hermit, according to Olivelle, is a forest or wilderness dweller who fends for himself, and therefore is not “domesticated,” we might say. The renouncer, on the other hand, lives in total dependence upon a community. “Whereas the hermit leaves society and lives independent of it, the renouncer rejects society but lives in absolute dependence on it.”¹ He goes on:²

The renouncer, like the hermit, lives outside the village in the wilderness. His separation from the village, however, is not total. He returns to the village to beg for food. Although he is associated with the wilderness, his main difference from the villager is that he is a homeless wanderer. The distinctive feature of village or city culture is that its participants belong to a place. They identify themselves as belonging to a country (or kingdom), a region, a town or village, and a home. To them the

¹ Olivelle 1990: 135.

² Olivelle 1990: 139-40.

vagabond and the nomad typify the barbarian. When the renouncer returns to the pre-cultural nomadic state he breaks one of the strongest bonds of culture. While the hermit retires to the wilderness and establishes a domicile parallel to the village, the renouncer roams restlessly through wilderness and village, a constant challenge to the virtue of stability.

To be sure, although Olivelle does appeal to a “basic metaphor of Indian asceticism,” he is primarily concerned here not with some over-arching symbolic or theoretical framework, but with structures of Brahmanical society. It is a tribute to the extent, perhaps, to which Indian Buddhism is thoroughly Indian that while the Buddhist model must be understood to differ here and there from the Brahmanical model, in the main, *mutatis mutandis*, the following formulation may be applied to the case of Buddhist ascetics as well:¹

Village is the human habitat, the locus of Vedic culture, a place of purity and safety. Wilderness is the antithesis of village. It is a place of danger, impurity, and desolation, the habitat of wild beasts, barbarians, and evil spirits. It is where people dispose of their dead. Asceticism inverts the accepted value of these symbols. We witness here the emergence of a new world-view, a new understanding of humans and cosmos that rejected the basic assumptions of the Vedic world.... Wilderness is freedom; village is bondage. This is the basic metaphor of Indian asceticism.

I think we can suggest, then, that in the sense developed by Olivelle the Buddhist *saṅgha* as *saṅgha* — that is, as a community of renouncers rather than as a confederacy of true wandering ascetics or of hermits — is by nature domesticated in Strenski's sense. What I mean by this is that we should imagine the “wilderness dwellers” of the *Ratna-rāśi*, if not those of even the earliest “ascetic poetry” of the Buddhists as well, to be renouncers rather than hermits, to be members of a community and members of an economy, rather than totally outside of that exchange network. The implications for us in

¹ Olivelle 1990: 131-32.

the present case are plain: the Mahāyāna communities we imagine or construct, even communities of “forest dwellers,” “wilderness dwellers,” “refuse rag robe wearers,” “alms beggars,” or whatever type of śramaṇas one might want to suggest, are, of course, precisely “domesticated” in Strenski’s sense. They *exist* by virtue of their participation in patterns of exchange with a lay community.

When we look at what the *Ratnarāśi* has to say about the actual activities of the wilderness dwellers or those who live on alms (these distinguished in one sense, but certainly not to be understood as mutually exclusive categories), it is plain that these monks are imagined precisely as members of such a domesticated saṅgha. This has profound implications for our argument, since as far as we might go in suggesting that the *Ratnarāśi* represents a conservative, even reactionary, trend in Mahāyāna Buddhist thought, leaning heavily toward the ascetic and the self-denying, there is still absolutely no question here of a denial of economic reliance on the laity, or of communal dwelling in areas which cannot be far away from the “village.” I suggested above that the *Ratnarāśi* represents in some ways very strict tendencies in Buddhist renunciant thought, but it is necessary, perhaps, to point out that this does not imply any denial of what we might call, in light of the discussion above, the essential domestication of its imagined monastic community.

This is, on the other hand, not to say that there are not certain expressions in the text which might suggest that the opposite is the case. Chapter five, on the Wilderness dweller, contains examples of just such statements. The wilderness dweller is warned in V.2 to

make his bed and seat in a wilderness, an abode in the forest, and a border area. He should dwell in wilderness border regions such as those without thieves, herdsmen or shepherds, without snakes, without wild beasts and flocks of birds, with few flies and stinging insects, with little noise, with few sounds of commotion.

He is also advised to be prepared to die in the wilderness like an animal (V.3.5). At the same time it is assumed that he will enter villages and towns in search of alms, and that he will dwell together with others with whom he should share his alms. He is clearly a social agent.

It should probably come as no surprise, given the close connection between the organization of the *Ratnarāṣi* and the *dhūtaguṇa* idea, that a text devoted especially to the latter category should have much in common with the *Ratnarāṣi*. I would like to quote a few passages from the “Twelve Dhūtaguṇa Sūtra,” 十二頭陀經, correlating the passages with those in the *Ratnarāṣi*. Let us compare *Ratnarāṣi* V.3 with the following:¹

When a wilderness dwelling monk practices the dhuta ascetic purification practices, he should consider: ‘I am now in an isolated spot. For the sake of unexcelled perfect awakening I will abandon even my body, my life and my wealth and cultivate the three stable things.’² My death should be like a death from exhaustion with the world, death without producing any affection [for life].’ If he is sick and suffering, waiting for someone [to help him], he should think: ‘I am now alone. For the sake of the Teaching I renounced the world, and the Teaching is my companion. If I vigorously practice the Teaching, then this will be my salvation.’ This is [the definition of] one who practices the wilderness dwelling practice.

In the beginning one dwells in a house, with many sufferings. But abandoning one’s father and mother, wife and children, one renounces the world to cultivate awakening, and following a teacher practices with him. He distances himself from mental attachments and the mass of sensual distractions. Therefore he undertakes the practice of wilderness dwelling. He isolates himself from garrulous association with others and dwells in an isolated spot. Isolation means separation from gatherings of garrulous talking, like a place where cow herds [meet]. It is best if one not approach such a spot closer than three *li*. If one has been able to isolate oneself

¹ 十二頭陀經 T. 783 (XVII) 720c11-21. Compare the translation of this passage in Dantine 1991: 15-16.

² The eternal body of truth, life of complete wisdom, and wealth of awakening.

physically, then one should also isolate one's mind from the five desires and the five obstructions (**nīvaraṇa*). The practice of wilderness dwelling should be carried out like this.

Later (V.13 and 15) the *Ratnarāṣi* suggests the generosity one should feel toward the worms which populate the human body, and toward the creatures of the forest. Again, we find a remarkably close parallel in the "Twelve Dhūtaguṇa Sūtra." There we read:¹

The fifth type [of practitioner, one who practices moderation in eating, *bhojanamātra*] when he takes a single meal should think thus: 'Now, if I see thirsty, needy people I will give them a portion [of my alms]. I will be a donor [**dānapatī*], and they will be the receivers.' And having given, he makes a vow saying: 'May this cause all beings to increase their merit and may it rescue them. They must not fall into craving.' And taking his food to a lonely, quiet spot, removing one portion of what he is carrying he places it on top of a clean rock and presents it to the birds and beasts. And again he makes a vow as before. If at some time he wants to eat, he should spread out his sitting mat and clean his hands. Then he should think: 'In this body there are 80,000 worms. When the worms get their nourishment they are all totally at ease. Now I am taking this food and giving it to these many worms. Later, when I have obtained awakening, I will give them [instead] the gift of the teachings [**dharmadāna*]. You [?] are doing this in order to not reject living beings.' If one does not see troubled, needy beings, still one only eats two thirds of the portion, for the sake of one's own limbs, body, and life. If the practitioner has a greedy attitude and eats to excess, his chest will swell up, his belly distend and it will cause difficulties for his practice of the path. If, however, he leaves aside one portion then his body will be light, at ease, easily worn out, without distress. There being no injury to his body, he can practice the path without difficulties. Therefore one should accept alms according to the rule of eating in moderation.

Finally, we may refer to the expressions in *Ratnarāṣi* VI.13, which reads as

¹ 十二頭陀經 T. 783 (XVII) 721a14-25.

follows:

If the monk, Kāśyapa, who undertakes alms begging practice begs for alms in a village, town or city and does not obtain [any], if he returns with his begging bowl as it was when it was washed [clean and empty], he should think to himself: “Contemplating the Tathāgata, the Tathāgata shining bright by the splendor of his merit, who went forth [into the renunciant life] having abandoned the Universal Kingship, who is honored by gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas, who has abandoned all negative qualities, possessor of all positive qualities, free of all defilements — if even he, when he went to a village for alms, came back with his begging bowl as it was when it was washed, what reason is there to be upset when one like me, of small merit, who has not produced roots of good, returns with begging bowl as it was when it was washed. Why? Because one who has not produced roots of good will not obtain good food.

Compare this to the following from the “Twelve Dhūtaguṇa Sūtra:”¹

The second type [of practitioner of the dhuta ascetic practices, the practitioner of the practice of living on alms food, *paiṇḍapātika*,] when he enters a town or village for alms should control the six senses and not be attached to material form, sound, smell, taste or the tangible. Again, he should not distinguish between male and female, and whether he does or does not receive alms his mind should be equanimous. Whether [the alms] are good or bad, he is neither elated nor dejected.² When he does not obtain alms, he should think: ‘The Tathāgata Śākyamuni gave up the Universal Emperorship to renounce and attain awakening. Still, [even] he had the experience of entering a town in search of alms and obtaining none. How can I, a man bereft of merit, and lacking virtue, expect to obtain any [alms]?’ This is the practitioner of the practice of living on alms food.

The history of the “Twelve Dhūtaguṇa Sūtra” is not at all clear, and we have little

¹ 十二頭陀經 T. 783 (XVII) 720c22-27.

² The expression translated here as “neither elated nor dejected,” 不生增減, is not clear. It usually means “neither increase nor decrease,” as Dantinne, who has translated the passage (1991: 67-68), has rendered it: “Que cela soit bon ou mauvais, cela m’engendre ni augmentation, ni diminution.” But I do not see how that makes any sense here, and so I speculatively understand as I have translated.

way of knowing the possible historical relationship between it and the *Ratnarāśi*. It is clear, however, that either one text knew the other or that they shared a common source, for the degree to which they agree in some of their wording makes any other hypothesis highly unlikely.

If one wanted to explore in detail the issues of the three practices discussed here, wilderness dwelling, alms begging and the wearing of rag robes, it would easily be possible to fill a whole book or two. In particular it would be possible to show the close connection, in this regard, between the *Ratnarāśi* and, for example, the *Ugradattapari-prcchā*, as Mochizuki has already to a large extent done.¹ I think I have made the point, however, even with these few words, that the *Ratnarāśi*'s use of these classical types establishes its ideology as solidly orthopractic.

If the text is concerned with practice, then, who is the practitioner? In the *Ratnarāśi* a key term which appears repeatedly, in addition to the fairly generic śramaṇa, is *yogācāra bhikṣu*. The latter appears not only in our text, however, but throughout much of Buddhist literature, and so to this topic we now turn.

¹ Mochizuki 1988: 351-76. This section of his book is, in fact, verbatim Mochizuki 1969.

Textual Sources:

D) *Maitreyamahāsimhanāda-sūtra*: Tibetan: P 102b4-103b5, M 167b1-168b1, S 207a2-208a6; Chinese: 512a23-b18:

'od srung yang phyi ma'i tshe phyi ma'i dus lnga brgya pa tha ma de la ming gis
zil gyis non cing kha dog dang / rtags dang / dbyibs kyis dge sbyong du 'gyur gyi tshul
khrims kyis ma yin / ting nge 'dzin gyis ma yin / shes rab kyis ma yin pa dag kyang
'byung bar 'gyur te / 'od srung 'di ltar ste dper na mi gsang sngags dang sman dag gis
gos la 'debs shing bsgo [P bsko, S sgom] bar byed la / gang gis gos de gyon pa na /
zhag bdun nam zhag brgyad kyis de'i lus me lce gcig tu gyur cing kun tu 'bar byed pa la
la zhig yod par gyur cing / des gos de gsang sngags dang sman dag gis btab cing yongs
su bsgoms nas mi mdza' ba la la zhig la 'di lta ste / mdza' bshes kyi tshul gyis byin par
gyur la / de nas mi des kyang gos de mdzes pa yin par rig nas len par byed cing / blangs
nas kyang gyon par gyur na / de zhag bdun nam zhag brgyad kyi bar du ni gos de las
dga' ba nyams su myong bar 'gyur ro // de nas zhag bdun nam zhag brgyad 'das nas mi
de khyim du song ngam lam po cher song ba na / gos de rab tu 'bar bar gyur cing de nas
mi de gzhi de las tshul ma yin pa'i sdug bsngal skyes par gyur te / tshig par gyur / shi bar
gyur na /

'od srung 'di ji snyam du sems / gos de las ro myang ba ni ci tsam zhig yod / nyes
dmigs ni ji tsam zhig yod snyam //

'od srung gis gsol pa / bcom ldan 'das ro myang ba ni chung lags kyi / nyes
dmigs ni dpag tu ma mchis lags so //

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / 'od srung de bzhin du nga'i gos ngur smrig
tshul khrims dang / ting nge 'dzin dang / shes rab dang / rnam par grol ba dang / rnam
par grol ba'i ye shes mthong bas bsgos pa gang dag yin pa de dag kyang / bskal pa bye
ba grangs med pa nas legs par spyad pas yang dag par bsgrub pa yin na / mi blun po
dge sbyong ltar bcas pa de dag ni drang srong gi rgyal mtshan gyon nas grong dang
grong khyer dang / grong rdal dang / yul 'khor dang / rgyal po'i pho brang 'khor dag
tu 'jug par 'gyur zhing / de nas bram ze dang / khyim bdag dad pa rnams kyis de dag
dge sbyong yin no snyam nas bkur sti byed / bla mar byed / ri mor byed / mchod pa byed
par 'gyur zhing / de dag gos ngur smrig gi gzhi de las mchod pa rnyed par 'gyur bas /
de dag des dga' ba nyams su myong bar yang 'gyur ro // de dag lus zhig nas ni sems can
dmyal bar ltung bar 'gyur zhing / de dag der lcags kyi glegs ma 'bar ba gyon par 'gyur /
lcags kyi thu lum za bar 'gyur / lcags kyi khu ba bskol ba 'thung bar 'gyur / mal stan
rab tu 'bar ba dag gi steng du nyal bar 'gyur ro //

'od srung de dag ni rang gi las des lus zhig nas sems can dmyal bar 'gro bar zad
 kyi / gzhi gang las mi blun po de dag gis kyang bde bar sbyar ba rnam pa du ma nyams
 su myong bar 'gyur ba'i gos ngur smrig gi dpal dang gzi brjid de 'dra ba la ltos / 'od
 srung ngas kyang de las dgongs nas 'di skad ces / lcags kyi glengs ma dag gyon pa ni
 bla'i / tshul khrims 'chal bas gos ngur smrig dag bgo ba ni de lta ma yin no // lcags kyi
 thu lum dag bza' ba ni bla'i / tshul khrims 'chal pas bsod snyoms dag la yongs su longs
 spyod pa de lta ma yin no zhes gsungs so // 'od srung de la ro myang ba ji tsam yod pa
 dang / de la nyes dmigs ci tsam yod pa la ltos te / 'od srung de lta bas na ji nas kyang
 tshul khrims yongs su dag par 'gyur ba dang / sdig pa 'chags par 'gyur ba de ltar bslab
 par bya'o //

II) *Ratnamegha-sūtra*: The Tibetan text is Derge 231: mdo sde, wa, 85b5-86b5; Peking 897: mdo, dzu 91a5-92a6. The Chinese versions are found at T. 489 (XIV) 738b9-c15 = T. 658 (XVI) 231b13-c11 = T. 659 (XVI) 267c3-268a3 = T. 660 (XVI) 316b18-c21:

rigs kyi bu chos bcu dang ldan na byang chub sems dpa' bsod snyoms pa rnams
 yin no // bcu gang zhe na / 'di lta ste / (1) sems can rnams la phan par zhugs pa rnams
 yin / (2) mthar gyis bsod snyoms len pa rnams yin / (3) yongs su yi 'chad pa med pa'i
 rang bzhin can rnams yin / (4) chog shes pa rnams yin / (5) bgo bsha' byed pa'i dang
 tshul can rnams yin / (6) ma chags pa rnams yin / (7) bsod snyoms bza' ba la tshod shes
 pa rnams yin / (8) dge ba'i phyogs la mngon du phyogs pa rnams yin / (9) dge ba'i rtsa
 ba shin du yongs su bsod pa rnams yin / (10) ril po'i 'du shes med pa rnams yin no //

rigs kyi bu de la ji ltar na byang chub sems dpa' sems can rnams la phan par
 zhugs pa yin pa nas / ji ltar na ril po'i 'du shes med pa'i bar du yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu
 'di la byang chub sems dpa' sems can dge ba'i rtsa ba chung ba dang / dge ba'i rtsa ba
 chung ngu dang ldan pa sdug bsngal ba dag mthong na / sems can de dag la phan par
 bya ba'i phyir bsod snyoms pa'i yi dam 'dzin te / de nas nam grong ngam / grong khyer
 ram / grong 'dab du bsod snyoms kyi phyir 'gro ba de'i tshe dran pa shin du nye bar
 bzhag pa dang / spyod lam mdzes pas dbang po mi g-yo ba dang / dbang po mi rgod pa
 dang / dbang po dul ba dang / gnya' shing gang tsam du lta ba dang / dge ba'i chos
 rnams la dran pa shin du nye bar bzhag cing bsod snyoms kyi phyir 'gro'o // de bsod
 snyoms kyi phyir 'gro na bsod snyoms mthar gyis len pa yin te / mgo 'phang bstod cing
 bram ze'i rigs shing sa la ltar che zhing mtho ba'i grong ngam / rgyal rigs shing sa la
 ltar che zhing mtho ba'i grong ngam / khyim bdag shing sa la ltar che zhing mtho ba'i

grong 'byor pa dag tu mi 'jug gi mtha' gcig nas bzung ste / nam de'i don grub par gyur
gyi bar du bsod snyoms la spyod de /

gzhan du na gnas gang na khyi za ba'am / ba drus ma'am / byol song gi skye gnas
su gtogs pa rang bzhin gyis ngang tshul gyis ngan ba'i srog chags sam / bud med dang /
skye pa dang / khye'u dang / bu mo kyal ka bya ba'i bsam pa can dag yod pa'am / smad
pa'i gnas thams cad du thams cad yongs su spong ste / de mthar gyis bsod snyoms la 'gro
na yongs su yi mi 'chad cing kun nas nyon mongs pa med la / sems can de dag la chags
pa yang mi skyed / khong khro ba yang mi skyed de / yongs su yi 'chad pa med pas so so
ci rigs pa'i bsod snyoms ngan ngon gyis chog shes pa yin te / des bsod snyoms de blangs
nas bdag gi gnas su 'ongs te / lhung bzed dang / chos gos bzhag / rkang lag bskrus te //
de bzhin gshegs pa'i gzugs sam / de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten rnams la bkur sti dang
/

rim gro byas te / gnas su song nas / bsod snyoms de las cha gcig ni tshangs pa
mtshungs par spyod pa rnams kyi phyir gzhas go // gnyis pa ni sdug bsngal ba rnams kyi
phyir gzhas go // gsum pa ni sems can log par ltung ba rnams kyi phyir gzhas go // cha
bzhi pa ni bdag za ste / de za ba na 'dod chags med par za ste / chags par ma yin / brkam
par ma yin / zhen par ma yin gyi / gzhan du na ji tsam du lus gnas par 'gyur ba dang /
'tsho bar bya ba'i phyir za ste / ji ltar ha cang yang nyams dma' ba dang / ha cang yang
lus lci bar mi 'gyur ba de ltar za ste / de ci'i phyir zhe na / ha cang yang nyams dmas na
ni dge ba'i phyogs la rgyab kyis phyogs par 'gyur ro // lus ha cang lci na ni gnyid kyis
non par 'gyur ro // des bsod snyoms de zos nas dge ba'i phyogs la mngon du phyogs pa
dang / brtson 'grus brtsams pa dang / le lo med pa dang / snyom pa med pa dang / byang
chub kyi phyogs kyi chos yongs su rdzogs par 'gyur bar bya'o // de byang chub kyi
phyogs kyi chos yongs su 'dus pas bdag tu 'dzin pa med pa yin / bdag tu 'dzin pa med pas
bdag gi shas kyang sems can rnams la phan 'dogs pa yin no // rigs kyi bu chos bcu bo de
dag dang ldan na byang chub sems dpa' bsod snyoms pa rnams yin no //.

Chapter 4

Perfect and Imperfect: Past, Present and Future

The present chapter is not concerned with perfect and imperfect in grammar, but with religious practitioners, the good, the bad and the ugly. In some sense, the ideal human being, the “realized” man or woman, is the center of ultimate concern in the religion of Buddhism. For although there has been considerable discussion concerning the “central philosophy” of Buddhism, with some suggesting that the idea of dependent co-origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*) is the key Buddhist idea, others the doctrine of emptiness (*śūnyatā*), and so on, there should be little debate that, when all is said and done, Buddhism taken as a whole is ultimately a soteriological path. Although it may seem that certain strands of the vast Buddhist tradition have occasionally lost sight of this focus, it would be hard to argue, I think, that one could legitimately speak of a Buddhism divorced from a soteriology. The way in which this focus on the quest for human perfection is expressed differs radically, of course, through the multifarious Buddhist traditions.

In Mahāyāna Buddhism in general it may be fair to say that the ideal type is represented by the bodhisattva. This is a concept and a figure which has received considerable attention in the scholarship on Buddhism, and it is not my intention to discuss it further in a general way here.¹ While it is certainly helpful and suggestive to

¹ It should be unnecessary to provide even a short list of references to discussions of the concept and figure of the bodhisattva in Buddhism, but for the sake of completeness we might refer to the detailed studies of Dayal 1932 and Kamibayashi 1939, and on the term itself Kajiyama 1982 and Sugimoto 1991. What studies do exist are almost all written in Japanese.

generalize about concepts such as that of the bodhisattva, it is probably equally valuable to look more specifically at what different texts — or as I have suggested we approach the matter, different “imagined communities” — have to say about their own ideal types. In the case of the *Ratnarāśi*, the term bodhisattva appears only twice, once in a reference to those in attendance when the sūtra was preached, and a second time in a reference to followers of the three vehicles. The ideal type here is clearly not to be identified primarily with the bodhisattva, but rather I think with the śramaṇa, and more specifically with the *yogācāra bhikṣu*. To investigate the issue, then, I would like to examine the ideas of the śramaṇa and the *yogācāra* monk as they are found in the *Ratnarāśi* and in other Buddhist literature. Having sketched what I think this “ideal type” represents, I will turn to an examination of the “anti-ideal,” the apotheosis of the bad or evil Buddhist.

I have mentioned several times the crucial fact that the *Ratnarāśi* and related literature is, in its ideological orientation, highly ascetic. There should in itself be nothing particularly surprising in this, but for the fact that most modern pictures of Mahāyāna Buddhism paint it as a movement “freer,” more open to innovation, and in general more “liberal” than “Conservative” Buddhism, or what I refer to as Background Buddhism. As I have also mentioned, a serious attempt to contrast generalized Background Buddhism, or even the Buddhism of any particular sect or textual corpus, with the Buddhism of any Mahāyāna community will require not only a careful study of Mahāyāna texts but also a careful re-examination of the materials upon which we base our knowledge of Sectarian Buddhism.¹ It is regrettably beyond the scope of the present study to undertake such a detailed examination of sources in Pāli and Chinese, and as a result of this limitation much of what I have to say about the comparisons between the

¹ It is not superfluous to add that, as far as Chinese Āgamic sources for the doctrines and ideologies of Sectarian Buddhism go, what is called for is not a *re*-examination but an initial survey of the material, much of which has been studied heretofore hardly at all.

Buddhism of the *Ratnarāṣi* and that of Background Buddhism must remain more than usually tentative and to some extent speculative. On the other hand, I think the general trends are clear enough to strongly suggest, if not prove, the overall assertion that the Mahāyāna Buddhism represented by the *Ratnarāṣi* and related materials, and the image of the ideal religious practitioner presented in these materials, is anything but a radical departure from the models of ideal religious figures in Background Buddhism. What is more, to a large extent these are portraits shared by the Jaina tradition and even the, relatively later, Brahmanical ascetic traditions.

Our first and most emphatic indication of this point comes right at the outset of the sūtra, when it is announced that the topic of the text as a whole is the śramaṇa. We are not dealing here with the bodhisattva, with the gentle son or gentle daughter (*kula-putra*, *kuladuhitra*), or even with the monk, but instead with the paradigmatic Buddhist ascetic, the śramaṇa. There is no question that the idea of the śramaṇa is very old, certainly predating even the rise of Buddhism. It is, on the other hand, not correct as has occasionally been done in the past, to connect this concept or term with the certainly still much older *shaman*, an entirely different and unrelated religious figure.¹

It is important to emphasize that the term śramaṇa is not definable in the same way as the term *bhikṣu* or monk. The latter is an objective category, and one qualifies as a monk based upon participation in certain ordination rites and rituals. A śramaṇa, on the other hand, is defined by a state of being, a quality, as it were. The *Ratnarāṣi* is concern-

¹ See Laufer 1917, and Németh 1913-14. Although only tangentially related to this problem, we may note that there can be no question that, although Pāli for instance has the form *samaṇa*, the Sanskrit *śramaṇa* is both historical and correct. If proof be necessary it is provided by the fact that the initial cluster is retained in Gāndhārī, which in fact shows both the historical (or pedantic / learned) form *śramaṇa* and the more Prakritic form *ṣamaṇo*. The initial *ṣ*- of the latter proves the initial cluster *śr*-. This does not of course rule out the possibility of a very old form existing along with or even prior to Sanskrit forms but in Prakritic phonology. Anyway, the arguments against the connection between the words *śramaṇa* and *shaman* are not based on its Indic shape but are related solely to the phonological history of the word Siberian "*shaman*," in which the initial *sh*- is not historical (being derived from initial *k*-).

ed, then, right at the outset in the long section I.2, in offering its own definition of the *true śramaṇa*, or we might say, the *śramaṇa* in the pregnant sense.

The items making up the list in I.2 are quite conventional, and virtually none of them could be understood as anything other than extremely orthodox even in a Sectarian buddhist context. Similarly, in section I.4 the impurities of the *śramaṇa* are described, and these too seem wholly conventional and orthodox, meaning practically speaking that we can find the same sorts of expressions in the Nikāya / Āgama corpus as well. In I.6 the text states that it is not the outward physical appearance and attributes which make a *śramaṇa*, but rather the fact that one practices virtuous qualities that is crucial.

The sort of general ideal that the *Ratnarāśi* professes is, I want to suggest, hardly unique in Buddhist literature. As just one example from a relatively well studied area of Buddhist literature we may point to a passage in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, in which the fourth *bhūmi* is described as follows:¹

And again, Subhūti, the [bodhisattva] mahāsattva in the fourth stage should be fixed in ten qualities, and should not reject them. What are the ten? They are, namely: 1) dwelling in a wilderness, 2) having few desires, 3) being satisfied, 4) not giving up the austerities of the dhuta ascetic purification practices, 5) not rejecting the trainings, 6) shrinking from lustful qualities, 7) producing aspiration connected with aversion to the world, 8) rejection of all existents, 9) having a mind free of timidity, 10) being indifferent to all material things. These are the ten qualities which the bodhisattva mahāsattva in the fourth stage should not reject. And this should be established.

Despite the fact that there is actually a considerable difference in tone and

¹ Dutt 1934: 215.13-18, almost the same at Ghoṣa 1902-1913: 1455.20-1456.5: *punar aparāṇi subhūte mahāsattvena caturthyāṃ bhūmau vartamāṇena daśasu dharmeṣu sthātavyam / tena ca na partityaktavyāḥ / katameṣu daśasu / yad uta aranyavāso 'lpecchatā / santuṣṭhir dhūtaguṇasamlekhānut-sarjanam śikṣāyā aparitāgāḥ kāmguṇavijugupsanam nirvītsahagataś cittotpādaḥ sarvāstiparityāgitā anavalīnacittatā sarvavastunirapekṣatā / ime subhūte daśa dharmā bodhisattvena mahāsattvena caturthyāṃ bhūmau vartamāṇena na parityaktavyā / eṣa ca sthātavyam /*. See Conze 1975: 164, and Dayal 1932: 276. The passage is commented upon in detail in the *Da zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 415a29-b28, translated in Lamotte 1944-80: 2409-13.

approach between most of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* texts, including the *Ratnarāśi*, and most of the *Prajñāpāramitā* texts, such a passage as that just quoted would not be out of place in the *Ratnarāśi* or in many other texts concerned with the proper attitude and bearing of the renunciant monk. Nor — and this likewise is crucial — would it be out of place in a *Nikāya* / *Āgama* context, were the terms *bodhisattva* and *bhūmi* to be removed.

In this context, let us look at the parallel discussion in the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. I have mentioned above that I think it is quite possible that the *Ratnarāśi*'s authors were aware of this text, and that it is possible that they consciously created the *Ratnarāśi* as a sort of “appendix” to the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, or as an effort to expand on some of its critical themes and ideas. Due to the importance of the comparison, we will quote the relevant passages from the *Kāśyapaparivarta* at length:¹

People commonly use the word “śramaṇa,” Kāśyapa. In how many ways, Kāśyapa, do they use the term “śramaṇa”? These śramaṇas, Kāśyapa, are of four [types]. Which are the four? They are namely, (1) the one who is a śramaṇa by virtue of his figure, outward form, distinguishing marks and appearance; (2) the one who is a śramaṇa deceitful while guarding good behavior; (3) the one who is a śramaṇa interested in fame, renown and celebrity; and (4) the one who is a śramaṇa engaged in real correct practice. These, Kāśyapa, are the four śramaṇas.²

Now, Kāśyapa, who is the one who is a śramaṇa by virtue of his figure, outward form, distinguishing marks and appearance? Here, Kāśyapa, there will be someone who possesses the figure, outward form, distinguishing marks and appearance of a śramaṇa. He is clothed in a monastic robe, with shaven head, grasping in his hand a fine begging bowl, yet his conduct is

¹ I have given here the translation shorn of all philological and other notes. There are quite considerable difficulties with any number of phrases in the following, but I ask the reader to bear with me and patiently await the complete edition and annotated translation which G.M. Nagao and I will publish before long.

² KP §121: *śramaṇa śramaṇa iti kāśyapa ucyate / kiyaṃ nu tāvat kāśyapa śramaṇaḥ śramaṇa ity ucyate / catvāra ime kāśyapa śramaṇaḥ katame catvāraḥ yad uta varṇarūpalingasaṃsthānaśramaṇa / ācāraguṇtikuhakaśramaṇaḥ kīrtiśabdaślokaśramaṇaḥ bhūtapratipattiśramaṇaḥ ime kāśyapa catvāraḥ śramaṇaḥ /*

characterized by impure bodily acts, his conduct is characterized by impure vocal acts, his conduct is characterized by impure mental acts. He is unrestrained, unliberated, untamed, unpacified, unguarded, undisciplined, greedy, lazy, of wrong behavior and he conducts himself in sinful ways. This, Kāśyapa, is called the one who is a śramaṇa by virtue of his figure, outward form, distinguishing marks and appearance.¹

Now, Kāśyapa, who is the śramaṇa who is deceitful while guarding good behavior? Here, Kāśyapa, there will be some śramaṇa who is accomplished in acting well-behaved. He behaves circumspectly in all four modes of deportment, consumes coarse food and drink, is satisfied with the four saintly attitudes, does not mix with householders or renunciants, and is one of little speech and few words. But those modes of deportment are feigned with deceit and boasting [about his spiritual accomplishments]; they are not for the sake of the purification of the mind, nor for calming, nor for tranquility, nor for training. And he is one who holds to wrong speculations on objectification, and hearing that things are inconceivable because of emptiness he feels as if he has confronted an abyss. And he is displeased by monks who speak about emptiness. This, Kāśyapa, is called the śramaṇa who is deceitful while guarding good behavior.²

Now, Kāśyapa, who is the śramaṇa interested in fame, renown and celebrity? Here, Kāśyapa, some śramaṇa upholds the discipline, having calculated “How may others know me to be an upholder of the discipline?” He preserves what he has learned, having calculated “How may others know me to be very learned?” He lives in a wilderness, having calculated “How

¹ KP §122: *tatra kāśyapa katamo varṇarūpalingasamsthānaśramaṇaḥ iha kāśyapa ihekatya śramaṇavarṇarūpalingasamsthānasamanvāgato bhavati / saṃghāṭipariveṣṭhito muṇḍaśiraḥ supātra-pāṇaiḥ parigrhītaḥ sa ca bhavaty aparīsuddhakāyākarmasamudācāra aparīsuddhavākkarmasamudācāraḥ aparīsuddhamanaskarmasamudācārauḥ bhavati / ayukta amuktaḥ adāntaḥ aśāntaḥ aguptaḥ avinītaḥ lubdhaḥ alasoḥ duḥśīlappāpadharmasamācāraḥ ayam ucyate kāśyapa varṇarūpalingasamsthānaśramaṇaḥ //*

² KP §123: *tatra kāśyapa katamaḥ ācāraguṭtikukaḥ śramaṇaḥ iha [kāśyapa] ihaikatya śramaṇaḥ ācārācāritrasaṃpan[n]o bhavati saṃprajānacārī caturbhi uryāpathair lūhānnapānabhojī saṃtuṣṭaḥ caturbhir āryavaṃśer asaṃsr̥ṣṭo gr̥hasthapravrajitair alpabhāśyo lpamamtraḥ te cāsyeryāpathāḥ kuhanalapānatayā kalpitā bhavaṃti / na cittapariśuddhaye / na śamāya nopaśamāya / na damāya / upalaṃbhadr̥ṣṭika[m]ś ca bhavati / śūnyatānupalaṃbhāś ca dharmeṣu śrutvā prapātasamjñī bhavati / śūnyatāvādināṃ ca bhikṣuṇāṃ am̐tike aprasādasamjñīm utpādayati iyam ucyate kāśyapa ācāraguṭtikukaśramaṇaḥ //*

may others know me to be a wilderness dweller?" Calculatingly, he dwells with few desires, satisfied, apart. But he acts merely to deceive others, not for the sake of cultivating aversion to the world, not for the sake of destruction of lust, not for the sake of cessation, not for the sake of tranquility, not for the sake of complete awakening, not for the sake of attaining the state of a [true] śramaṇa, not for the sake of attaining the state of a [true] brāhmaṇa, not for the sake of nirvāṇa. This, Kāśyapa, is called the śramaṇa interested in fame, renown and celebrity.¹

Now, Kāśyapa, who is the śramaṇa engaged in real correct practice? He is that monk, Kāśyapa, who is disinterested in his own body and even in his own life, not to mention in profit, reverence or fame. Hearing the teachings of emptiness, the signless, and the wishless, he is delighted at heart. He has understood thusness and he lives a life of purity being disinterested even in nirvāṇa, not to mention in the delights of the triple realm. He is disinterested even in wrong speculations on emptiness, not to mention in wrong speculations on a self, living being, life-force, human or person. He takes the teachings as his refuge. He seeks the inward liberation from defilements; he does not run around outwardly. He sees all things as intrinsically extremely pure, undefiled. And he is an island unto himself; he is without any other island. He does not see the Tathāgata even as the [embodiment of the] teachings, not to mention in a physical body. He is not attached to the teachings even as being free from lust, not to mention as being expressible within the scope of speech. And he does not imagine the monastic community of the saints even as unconditioned, not to mention as a gathering of assemblies. He does not exert himself for the removal of any thing at all, nor for the cultivation, nor for the realization. He does not grow forth in saṃsāra, he does not delight in nirvāṇa. He does not seek liberation, nor the bondage [of this world]. Knowing that all things are intrinsically in the state of Parinirvāṇa, he does not circle in rebirth, nor does he enter Parinirvāṇa.

¹ KP §124: *tatra kāśyapa katamaḥ kīrtiśabdaślokaḥ śramaṇaḥ iha kāśyapa ihaikatya śramaṇaḥ pratisaṃkhyāya śīlaṃ rakṣati / kathamān pare jānīyuh śīlavatān iti / pratisaṃkhyāya śrutam udgrhñite kathamān pare jānīyur bahuśruta iti / pratisaṃkhyāyāraṇye prativasati / kathamān pare jānīyur āraṇyaka iti / pratisaṃkhyāya alpeccchaḥ saṃtuṣṭaḥ pravivikto viharati / yāvad eva paropadarśanāya na nirvedāya na virāgāya na nirodhāya / nopaśamāya / nā saṃbodhaye / na śrāmanyāya / na brāhmanyāya / na nirvāṇāya / ayam ucyate kāśyapa kīrtiśabdaślokaśramaṇa //*

This, Kāśyapa, is called the śramaṇa engaged in real correct practice.

One should exert oneself toward attaining the state of a [true] śramaṇa through real correct practice. One must not allow oneself to be injured by [being called by] the name [śramaṇa].¹ These, Kāśyapa, are the four śramaṇas.²

To the reader who has read both the *Ratnarāśi* and the passage just quoted, I think it should be relatively self evident why I say that the *Ratnarāśi* seems to be based in a very direct way on the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, and especially on this set of passages. The framework of the *Ratnarāśi*'s discussion of the positive and negative attributes of śramaṇas could have been lifted almost straight out of this *Kāśyapaparivarta* passage. While these passages do not seem to have been noticed by writers of Indian śāstras whose works are extant in Sanskrit or Tibetan, the entire set of sections is quoted verbatim in the *Daśabhūmivibhāṣā*, a work of uncertain but clearly Indian provenance.³

Although the term śramaṇa is prominently discussed in the *Ratnarāśi*, and

¹ That is, one should not allow oneself to be called "śramaṇa" when one is not, since this will result in injury to oneself. The commentary (Staël-Holstein 1933: 229) explains that by means of the name śramaṇa one wrongly enjoys the gifts of faith. There are some serious textual problems here, but I refer the reader to my forthcoming translation for details.

² KP §125: *tatra kāśyapa katamo bhūtapratipattiḥ śramaṇaḥ yaḥ kāśyapa bhikṣur anarthiko bhavati kāyena ca jīvitenaṇi / kaḥ punar vādo lābhasatkāraśloke / śūnyatā ānimitā apraṇihitāś ca dharmām śrutvā āptamano bhavati tathatvatāyām pratipattiṇo nirvāṇe cāpy anarthikā brahmacaryaṁ carati / kaḥ punar vādas traidhātukābhinandanatayā śūnyatādr̥ṣṭyāpy anarthiko bhavati / kaḥ punar vāda ātmasatvajīvapauṣapudgaladr̥ṣṭyā / dharmapratīsarāṇaś ca bhavati / kleśānām ca adhyātma-vimokṣa[m] margati / na bahirdhā dhāvati atyāntapariśuddhaś ca prakṛtyā sarvadharmā asaṁkṣiptān paśyati / ātmaadvipaś ca bhavaty ananyadvipaḥ dharmato pi tathāgataṁ na samanupaśyati kaḥ punar vāda rūpakāyena / virāgato pi dharmam nābhiniṣate kaḥ punar vāda uta vākpathodāharaṇena / asaṁskṛtam api cāryasamgham na vikalpayati / kaḥ punar vādo gaṇasamnipātataḥ nāpi kasyacid dharmasya prahāṇyābhiyukto— bhavati na bhāvanāyai na sāksikriyāya / na saṁsāre virohati / na nirvāṇam abhinandati / na mokṣam paryeṣate / na bandham / prakṛtiparinirvṛtā ca sarvadharmān viditvā na saṁsarati na parinirvāyati / ayam ucyate kāśyapa bhūtapratipattiḥ śramaṇaḥ // bhūta-pratipattiyā śrāmaṇyāyogaḥ karaṇīyo na nāmahetena bhavitavyo ime kāśyapa catvāra śramaṇā //*

³ T. 1521 (XXVI) 118c25-119b1. On the problem of the authorship of the treatise, which is traditionally ascribed to Nāgārjuna, see Hirakawa 1957. In a postscript attached to the reprint version of his article, he notes the subsequent views of other scholars who have discussed Nāgārjuna's works, but does not consider them in detail. Several full studies of the treatise have been published by Japanese scholars, but they are not available to me at present.

accorded considerable importance, it is perhaps not the most characteristic or distinctive term for the imagined ideal practitioner in this and related sūtras. This is a role taken by the *yogācāra bhikṣu*. As the term makes clear, we have to do here with a monk, but the exact signification of the term *yogācāra* is yet to be determined.

Let us first take a look at the use of the term in general. The word *yogācāra* is found in classical Sanskrit, where its primary sense is defined by dictionaries as “the practice or observance of Yoga.”¹ It is understood here as a *tatpuruṣa* compound. Especially in the Epic, a related term, *yogācārya*, is often found, but I am unsure whether *yogācāra* itself appears.² The term *yogācārya* is very easy to understand, being a *tatpuruṣa* compound constructed from *yoga* and *ācārya*, and it seems to mean just what we would expect: master of yoga.³ We will find, however, that the primary meaning of *yogācāra* in Buddhist literature seems to be as a *bahuvrīhi*, literally then “one who has yoga as his practice,” and so “a practitioner of yoga.” Discovering what this actually means is the goal of the present discussion.

Perhaps since the word *Yogācāra* is used, along with *Madhyamaka*, to refer to one of the two main schools of Mahāyāna philosophy, the *Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda*, it has not entirely escaped the notice of scholars. For the most part, however, their investiga-

¹ Apte 1957, s.v., but without citation. MW also cites the term as equivalent to *yogin*, again without reference. Böhtlingk and Roth 1855-75 s.v. *yogācāra* define it as “die Observanz des Joga,” as well as “Titel einer Schrift über den Joga,” citing for the second sense Mallinātha’s commentary on *Kumāra-sambhava* 3.47, but this is apparently an error. The texts I have been able to check have instead *Yogasāra* as the text’s title (see for example the edition of Thakur 1987). (The meaning of a Buddhist philosophical school is also, of course, noted by dictionaries.) According to the *Abhidhānārājendra*, the term *yogācāra* (s.v. *jogāyāra*) does not seem to occur in *Ardhamāgadhi* other than as the name of the Buddhist philosophical school.

² There are numerous references in the *Mahābhārata* to *yogācārya*. For example 1.60.42 reads *yogācāryo mahābuddhir daityānām abhavad guruḥ / surānām cāpi meghāvi brahmacārī yatavrataḥ // Nilakaṇṭha* comments: *devānām gurur eva yogācāryo yogabalena kāyadvayaṁ kṛtvā devānām apy ācāryo bhavad ity arthaḥ /*. The term *yogācārya* appears also for example in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 9.12.3. According to MW, *yogācārya* is sometimes wrongly written for *yogācāra* but, again, he gives no reference.

³ The exact meaning of the term *yoga* is of course not thereby clarified, but with the proviso that *yoga* itself may remain not fully determined, the compound is basically clear.

tions have started from the question of the relation of the term *yogācāra* (or its Chinese translations) with the doctrinal school of the same name. We, however, are not concerned here with the sense of *yogācāra* as “the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school of Buddhist doctrinal speculation.” It is in the meaning of an individual, a *yogācāra bhikṣu*, that the word appears in the *Ratnarāśi*, and this is the meaning which we wish to investigate here.¹

One of the first modern scholars to look into the meaning of the term *yogācāra bhikṣu* was Miyamoto Shōson.² Working without reference to Tibetan materials and at a time, more than sixty years ago, before many of the Sanskrit texts now published were available, Miyamoto nevertheless was able to recognize the equivalence of the Chinese translations 坐禪比丘 and 瑜伽師 as renderings of *yogācāra (bhikṣu)*. In addition, he also pointed out many of the most important relevant passages in Chinese texts, including the *Śrāvakabhūmi* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, now available in Sanskrit. Miyamoto is one of those whose projects centered around an exploration of the origins of the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school, and in that context he examined the question of who the *yogācāra bhikṣus* were, and why they might be important. He offered the opinion that the term *yogācāra* seems to refer primarily to meditative monks in general (the 坐禪比丘), and suggested that groups of these monks were connected for the most part with North

¹ I do not mean to imply that it is not perfectly proper to speculate on the connection between the *yogācāra bhikṣu* and the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school; it is simply not what I intend to do so here. Just such a connection is in fact being investigated by my friend Nobuyoshi Yamabe, who will include his findings in his own doctoral dissertation to be submitted to Yale University. Another attempt at such an investigation is that begun by Ron Davidson with his 1985 Berkeley doctoral dissertation. Several Japanese scholars have previously addressed the same issue, among whom we may refer, in addition to those whose work I will mention below, to Mukai 1978. Mukai suggests that the term Yogācāra as a school name is directly (直接的に) based on the śāstra called *Yogācārabhūmi*, in the same way that, he asserts, the school called Vaibhāṣika is based on the *Mahāvibhāṣā*, the Sautrāntika on the sūtras, and the Madhyamaka on the *Mūlamadhyamaka kārikās*.

² Miyamoto 1932. Demiéville 1954: 340, note 2, refers to a 1933 revision of this paper. I have only the 1985 reprint of the latter to hand, and refer to this rather than the original 1932 edition.

Western India, Kashmir and Gandhāra. While not all of his comments can be accepted uncritically, Miyamoto's paper made a very auspicious start on the problem. Unfortunately, perhaps because of the uninviting title of his paper which gives no hint as to its true contents, his research has not been widely influential.¹ At least one scholar, however, appreciated and used the work of Miyamoto, namely Nishi Giyū.²

Nishi was concerned with investigating the place of the *yogācāra* in, primarily, the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*.³ Nishi's detailed studies seek to identify the particular doctrinal position of the *yogācāra*, in addition to specifying the exact meaning of the term. Much of his discussion of the doctrinal minutiae of Abhidharma studies would be difficult and uninteresting to summarize and, fortunately for our present purposes, it is possible to merely cite one of his conclusions:⁴ "The *yogācāra* is, in India, a meditator (禪定行者), and should be seen as the precursor of the Chan masters of China." Another scholar to contribute to the question has been Nishimura Minori who observed, based primarily on some instances of the term in the Vinaya literature, and especially the *Abhisamācārikā* of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, that *yogācāra bhikṣu* does not seem to refer to a specialization, as it were, so much as to those monks who are, by-the-by, engaged in yogic praxis.⁵ I have profited much by being able to read the work of my predecessors, but I think that something more remains to be said, especially with regard to the question of the term *yogācāra bhikṣu* in Mahāyāna sūtra literature.

The main purpose of the present investigation, then, is to understand what the

¹ Demiéville 1954: 340, note 2, referred to Miyamoto's paper, but offered no corollary studies of his own. Nishimura 1974 and Mukai 1978 appear to be ignorant of Miyamoto's work.

² See Nishi 1939, 1974.

³ The titles of Nishi's papers refer to the place of the *yogācāra* in Sectarian Buddhism, but in practice he refers almost exclusively to the voluminous commentary on the Abhidharma, Saṅghabhadra's *Mahāvibhāṣā* T. 1545.

⁴ Nishi 1974: 361.

⁵ Nishimura 1974: 916.

term *yogācāra* means, and how it is used in Mahāyāna sūtra literature. Toward that end, however, it will also be necessary to gather as much information as possible about how the word is used everywhere in Buddhist literature. I would like, therefore, to begin by examining the references to *yogācāra* (*bhikṣus*) in Buddhist literature on a genre-by-genre basis. The first important fact we must note is that there do not appear to be any references at all to the term *yogācāra bhikṣu* in the canonical Nikāya / Āgama corpus.¹ The word *yogācāra* appears in fact to be missing entirely from the Pāli canon, as a *bahuvrīhi* or otherwise. The only exceptions to this seem to be due to wrong writings for the term *yoggācariya*, a term equivalent to **yogyācārya* and meaning something like “groom, trainer.”² We will discuss below a term which does occur, in late Pāli, and which may call forth our attention, namely *yogāvacara*. In any case, however, given the absence of the relevant term in the canonical Nikāya / Āgama corpus, let us begin our genre-wise survey with the Vinaya literature.

In the *Abhisamācārikā*, a portion of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya for which we have an extant Indic text, we find the term *yogācāra bhikṣu* occurring often. The Chinese translation generally understands this term as meaning “meditating / meditator monk,” 坐禪比丘.³ It is evident that those referred to in the *Abhisamācārikā* as *yogācāra bhikṣu*

¹ It is very difficult if not impossible to state categorically that the term does not appear in the Chinese Āgamas. We have, first of all, no comprehensive index to these materials, and second of all, even if we did, we would not know with any certainty whether a given Chinese term did or did not correspond to the Indic *yogācāra*. The stricture that the term is missing from the canonical Nikāya / Āgama corpus, then, must be understood with this proviso.

² See AN iii.28,17, reading *yoggācariyo*, with variant *yogācariyo*. MN iii.97, 8 reads *yogācariyo* without variant, and MN iii.222,29, SN iv.176,18 and Thag 1140 read *yoggācariyo* without variants. It should be noted, of course, that the PTS editions are not critical editions, and the absence of a variant reading cannot be taken too seriously. The term **yogyācārya*, by the way, does not seem to be found in Sanskrit. It is not registered in Böhtlingk and Roth 1855-75 or Schmidt 1928.

³ This was pointed out by de Jong 1974: 65. We may refer to the following instances (Sanskrit from the edition of Jinananda 1969): 106.9-107.11 = T. 1425 (XXII) 506b28-c10: *bhikṣuḥ yogācāro ... niṣaṇṇo cittaṃ samādhayaṣyāmīti* = 比丘 ... 坐禪. In the next sentence *tasya* (= of those *bhikṣuḥ yogācāro*) is rendered 坐禪比丘. Exactly the same constructions are found in 107.13-109.3 = T. 1425 (XXII) 506c19-507a3. At 203.5, 213.3-4, and 219.1 = T. 1425 (XXII) 512c14, 513b9, and 513c4, *yogācārā bhikṣū* = 諸坐

are the serious practitioners, those who require a quiet and undisturbed atmosphere for their, evidently meditative, practice. It is also apparent that they are monks to whom other monks must defer. This description agrees very well with the use of the term *yogācāra bhikṣu* in the *Ratnarāśi*.

The term appears also in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* of the same Mahāsāṃghika school. Gustav Roth discusses the term, and quotes it from *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* in the context of a story of the group of six bad nuns who attend a theatrical performance. Roth translates the relevant sentence:¹ “They (the nuns) stand silently, like those whose conduct emanates from disciplined concentration.” The Chinese translation here has 默然似如坐禪人.² Hirakawa rendered this:³ “(the bhikṣuṇīs) kept their mouths closed, and sat as if they were meditating.” This translation must be corrected in light of the Indic text; clearly 坐禪人 is intended here as a translation of *yogācārāḥ*. Both Roth and the more recent student of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, Édith Nolot, then, have understood *yoga* here as meaning “disciplined concentration” or “la conduite réfléchie.” The Chinese translation, however, apparently takes it to refer explicitly to the practice of seated meditation. An exact parallel to this passage in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya has the group of six bad monks watch a musical performance “like 坐禪比丘.”⁴

The same term, *yogācārā*, is found in another passage where it is used to contrast good nuns to ill-behaved nuns. There, as Roth has pointed out, corresponding to

禪比丘. However, at 215.1-2, 217.8, 220.15, and 222.9 = T. 1425 (XXII) 513b18, b26, c12, and c21, *yogācārā bhikṣū* = 諸比丘. The occurrence of the term in Sanskrit at 226.4 is apparently not rendered in Chinese, which is somewhat more terse than the Indic text at this point. (I should note that I am, in fact, aware that the reliability of Jinananda’s edition has been questioned, but in the absence of any alternative I have accepted his readings as is.)

¹ Roth 1970: XLIII-XLIV. §238 *tāyo dāni tūṣṇikās tiṣṭhanti yogācārā iva*. Roth’s translation is similar to that of Nolot 1991: 299 “elles restaient silencieuses comme des nonnes à la conduite réfléchie.”

² T. 1425 (XXII) 540b22.

³ Hirakawa 1982: 344.

⁴ T. 1425 (XXII) 494a9. There does not seem to be any similar expression in the parallel passages cited by Sasaki 1991 in his study of Vinaya rules on monks and musical performances.

yogācārā bhikṣuṇī the Chinese has only “good nuns.”¹ In yet another passage we have the same equivalence in Chinese.² Roth suggests that “No doubt the nuns are not characterized here as the followers of the *yogācāra* system.” This is quite correct, I believe, if by “the *yogācāra* system” Roth intends to refer to the philosophical school of that name, the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda. He continues, “In the Vinaya context, *yogācāra* qualifies nuns of mentally well disciplined conduct.” I think we will see in the following that this suggested definition can be considerably refined.

Since we lack corresponding Sanskrit materials for other sections of this Vinaya, the occurrence of the same Chinese terminology in additional passages in the same Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya provides no guarantee that we may assume the use of the same Indic technical terms. But if, in fact, the correspondences are more or less standard, then we also have several other references to *yogācārā bhikṣus* in the same Vinaya.³ If these correspondences may be relied upon for the Vinayas of other sects as well (which requires yet another “leap of philological faith”), it seems that the term appears there too in very much the same meaning and contexts, namely: those especially dedicated to meditative cultivation and practice.

The Sarvāstivāda Vinaya contains the story of two visiting monks, one of whom is called a 坐禪者.⁴ The corresponding rule in another, apparently Sarvāstivāda, text also has first 比丘坐禪, then in the next sentence 坐禪比丘.⁵ This visiting monk is injured by Upananda 跋難陀釋子, one of the “group of six evil monks.” The same story

¹ Roth 1970: §243. Chinese at T. 1425 (XXII) 541c2 has 善比丘尼. See the translation in Nolot 1991: 308.

² Roth 1970: §248. Chinese at T. 1425 (XXII) 542c18. See the translation in Nolot 1991: 316.

³ In the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya T. 1425 (XXII) 268b1 we find 坐禪比丘, who apparently meditate in darkness. At 468c7 the meaning is not clarified. At 482b3-5 we have monks walking about in wooden shoes disturbing meditating monks; the latter are called 坐禪比丘.

⁴ Sarvāstivāda Vinaya T. 1435 (XXIII) 79a23 in *Prāyaścittiya* 18.

⁵ 鼻奈耶 T. 1464 (XXIV) 880a20-22. In the first case I follow the variant reading.

is found in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya *Vinayavibhaṅga*, but without the technical term.¹ In another place in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya it is quite clear what 坐禪比丘 means, since it is stated that a monk went atop a hill and practiced seated meditation 坐禪.² This monk is referred to in the next sentence as 坐禪比丘. In another episode, a 坐禪比丘 goes to sleep. Attempting to wake him up by striking him with the meditation staff (法杖), the 行禪比丘 kills him. The latter is evidently a monk working in a supervisory capacity.³ Very similar episodes of a meditating monk 坐禪比丘 going to sleep and being killed instead of woken up, with the same technical terms, are also found,⁴ but in these following episodes it is a question not of *yogācāra bhikṣus* but of *āranyaka bhikṣus* and *paiṇḍapātika bhikṣus*. I think it is clear that a parallel but differential categorization is being assumed here of monks who are engaged in meditative practice, arrayed alongside of those who devote themselves to forest or wilderness dwelling, and those who are involved in alms begging practice. In another place, the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya suggests that 坐禪比丘 refers to monks who are engaged in meditation at that moment, as opposed to those who are, so to speak, professional meditators.⁵ The rule relates that the six bad monks drove out 坐禪比丘. The Buddha responds by stating his stipulation with the words 坐禪時, “at the time one is engaged in meditation.” The clear implication of this formulation is that the term 坐禪比丘 refers to “monks who are engaged in meditation,” rather than “meditation monks” as a vocational designation.

There are numerous references to those who, by some action or another, disturb monks engaged in meditation or “meditation monks.” In the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, a group of nuns builds a stūpa in the monastic compound, and with their laughing and so

¹ T. 1442 (XXIII) 788b27-789a25.

² T. 1435 (XXIII) 436c4-6:

³ T. 1435 (XXIII) 437a27-28.

⁴ T. 1435 (XXIII) 437b1-2, 5.

⁵ T. 1435 (XXIII) 467c3-5.

on disturb the meditating / meditation monks 諸坐禪比丘. One of the latter, *Kapila, denoted as a 長老, is said to “always delight in seated meditation 常樂坐禪,” and being so annoyed by the nuns, he destroys the stūpa built by them. Parallels to this story, which indicate that the group of nuns is to be understood as the famous “gang of six,” are found in the Pāli Vinaya and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, but without the relevant technical terms.¹ The same famous group of six evil nuns annoy meditating nuns 諸坐禪比丘尼 in a further episode,² while the six evil monks annoy meditators 諸坐禪者 in another.³ In another story, parrots make a loud noise and annoy the meditating / meditation monks 諸坐禪比丘 (the Buddha rules that one should make a loud noise to drive the parrots away),⁴ and in yet another, birds (type not specified) nest in the monastery and cry out at night, disturbing the meditating / meditation monks 諸坐禪比丘.⁵

Throughout the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya and in the passages parallel to those quoted from the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya in which the term *yogācāra* appears, good nuns and monks are characterized as “of few desires, satisfied, practicing the dhuta ascetic purification practices,” a classical formulation which is also found, for example, in the *Milindapañha*.⁶

While most of our references to *yogācāras* are positive, they are not, however, always unambiguous. The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya contains a story in which householders come to the monastery and their singing, dancing and general noise-making

¹ Dharmaguptaka Vinaya T. 1428 (XXII) 766c3-10. The parallels are: Pāli: Vinaya iv.308,9ff, *Bhikkhunīvibhāṅga*, *pācittiya* 52; Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya: Derge Kanjur, 'dul ba, da, 172b2-5. I owe both of the latter references to Gregory Schopen, 1989: 91, note 19, and 1994: 71.

² Dharmaguptaka Vinaya T. 1428 (XXII) 929c5.

³ Dharmaguptaka Vinaya T. 1428 (XXII) 847b18.

⁴ Dharmaguptaka Vinaya T. 1428 (XXII) 955a4-5.

⁵ Dharmaguptaka Vinaya T. 1428 (XXII) 978a21.

⁶ The terms are *alpecchā*, *saṃtuṣṭa*, and *dhūtaguṇa*^o, found for example in the *Milindapañha* 343.20: *bhikkhū dhutaṅgaṃ anugatā appicchā santuṭṭhā*.

disturb the meditating / meditation nuns 諸坐禪比丘尼.¹ If I understand correctly, however, it is these same nuns who are pained by this and commit the offence which occasions the rule (against defecating and urinating in water). The meditating / meditation nuns here, then, are not portrayed necessarily in a positive light. In the parallel rule in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, the nuns are referred to with the words 諸比丘尼坐禪行道.² These nuns seem to be equivalent to the six evil nuns in other versions.³

There is another well-known example of a negative usage of the designation *yogācāra*. This is found in a most peculiar passage in the *Mahāvastu*, in which the spiritual aspirant is advised to avoid *yogācāras*. “Those bodhisattvas in the fifth stage, O Son of the Conqueror, who uphold the dhuta ascetic purification practices⁴ and make a vow to attain awakening, endowed with four characteristics, fall back from the sixth stage. What are the four? 1) Having renounced the world in the instruction of the perfectly awakened buddha, they associate together with *yogācāras*.⁵ This passage

¹ Dharmaguptaka Vinaya T. 1428 (XXII) 739b18.

² Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya T. 1421 (XXII) 94a14.

³ For other versions see the references in Schmithausen 1991, note 176.

⁴ I have differed from the reading and understanding of Senart, Jones and Leumann and Shiraishi here, in that I do not understand *dhutadharmadhara* as an independent vocative but rather as in compound with the following *bodhisattvā*.

⁵ Senart 1882: i.120.7-9: *caturbhi bho jinaputra ākārair dhutadharmadharabodhisattvā bodhāye ye prapñidhenti pañcamāyāṃ bhūmau vartamānāḥ śaṣṭhyāṃ bhūmau vivartanti / katamehi caturhi / samyak-sambuddhānuśāsane pravrajitvā yogācārehi sārddham sambhuvam kurvanti /*

Jones 1949: i.94 rendered: “O son of the Conqueror and my pious friend, there are four ways in which Bodhisattvas who have made a vow to win enlightenment in the fifth *bhūmi* lapse and fail to reach the sixth. What are the four ways? Though the Bodhisattvas have taken up the religious life in the Buddha’s instruction, they yet join forces with the *Yogācāras*.” Leumann and Shiraishi 1957: 94 have: “Auf vier Arten, mein lieber Siegersohn, machen o du in den Dhuta-Tugenden Erprobter, die Bodhisattva’s, welche zur (Erlangung der) Bodhi (ihren) Prapñidhāna(-Wunsch) äußern (und) sich auf der fünften Stufe befinden, von der sechsten Stufe Rückschritte (d.h. auf vier Arten gelangen die Bodhisattva’s durch Rückschritte aus der sechsten Stufe in die fünfte). Auf welche vier (Arten)? (1) Nachdem sie in der Unterweisung der (oder eines) Vollerleuchteten als Mönche eingetreten sind, pflegen sie Umgang mit den *Yogācāra*(-Anhängern).” Concerning the term *yogācāra*, Senart 1882: i.469 remarked: “The general sense of the members of the sentence *yogācārehi* and so on is not uncertain: communication, joining together with the *Yogācāras* is represented as if criminal and as bringing about a downfall in the spiritual life.” Senart goes on, however, in a way which indicates that he understood the term *Yogācāra* to refer to the philosophical school of that name. Jones 1949: i.94, note 1, also seems to have thought so, as did Edgerton

contrasts rather sharply with the usual positive representations of *yogācāras*. We should, however, keep in mind the fact that, whoever these *yogācāras* are, the text does not specify that they are monks. Whether there might be any connection between this passage and the Vinaya passages just cited, in which nuns whose behavior is criticized were also characterized as **yogācāras*, I do not know.

Let us turn now to the Abhidharma literature, in which again the term is, if not common, at least not extremely rare. The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* contains the following passage:¹

In that regard the *yogācāras* say: A *rūpa* which has *samādhi* as its domain is produced for the meditator (*dhyāyin*) by the force of his *samādhi*. It is invisible because it is not within the domain of the visual sense. It cannot be damaged because it does not obstruct space. You may think: Now how is that *rūpa*? This is the same as in the case of the *avijñapti*. It is said that there is a *rūpa* which is free from the depravities. The *yogācāras* say that just *rūpa*, produced through the power of *samādhi*, when it is in *samādhi* which is free from the depravities, is itself free from the depravities.

In Chinese, Paramārtha renders the first *yogācāra* as 觀行師, *dhyāyin* as 觀行人, and the second *yogācāra* as 觀行人.² This type of instability in technical terms is characteristic of Paramārtha's translations. Xuanzang's translation, on the other hand, is, equally characteristically, consistent, with *yogācāra* both times rendered as 瑜伽師.³ Yaśomitra's *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* comments on this passage:⁴ "The *yogācāra* who

in BHSD s.v. *yogācāra*. This is, nevertheless, almost undoubtedly wrong.

¹ Pradhan 1975: 197.5-8, ad IV.4ab: *tatra yogācārā upadiśanti / dhyāyināṃ samādhiviśayo rūpaṃ samādhiprabhāvād utpadyate / cakṣurindriyāviśayatvāt anidarśanam / deśānāvarenaṭvād apratigham iti / atha matam / katham idānīm tat rūpaṃ iti / etad avijñaptau samānam / yad apy uktam anāsravarūpoker iti tad eva samādhiprabhāvasambhūtaṃ rūpaṃ anāsrave samādhāv anāsravaṃ varṇayanti yogācārāḥ /*

² T. 1559 (XXIX) 227a7-14.

³ T. 1558 (XXIX) 69b1-12.

⁴ Shastri 1971: 583-4: *mārgaṃ sammukhīkurvāṇo yogācāras tad rūpaṃ āśayaṃ cāśrayaṇ ca pratilabhate yat samyagdr̥ṣṭivād anāsravaṃ śīlaṃ pratilabhate / yasmin sati prakṛtiśīlatāyāṃ sanniṣṭhate / athavā anāsrave pi samādhau tad evaṃvidhaṃ rūpaṃ ta ācāryā icchanti /*

makes the path his chief aim acquires a *rūpa* which is mental intention and physical basis; he acquires morality free from the depravities as he has correct views. When he is in that state he dwells in a state of natural morality. Or: those masters maintain that even in *samādhi* without depravities there is such a type of *rūpa*.” As La Vallée Poussin remarks, “It turns out from the *Vyākhyā* that the term *Yogācāra* does not refer here to the adept of a certain philosophical school, but simply to the ascetic.”¹

Another and perhaps more important passage occurs later in the *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*:²

The *yogācāra* who cultivates this [contemplation on] impurity is said to be of three types: a beginner, a master,³ and an absolute master of mental reflection.

First of all, the *yogācāra* who wants to cultivate the [contemplation on] impurity fixes his mind on the limbs and members of his body, on his big toe, his forehead, or wherever it pleases him to do so. Purifying his bones by progressive zealous application of attention to his flesh, filled with pus, he sees [his body] as entirely a collection of bones. And in just the same way he zealously applies his attention to another person, progressively up through

¹ La Vallée Poussin 1923-31: iv.18, note 1. In the same note La Vallée Poussin further points out that Saeki Kyokuga 1887 has a long note on the term *yogācāra* (*juan* 13.7a-8a, reprint 557-59). In fact, although I do not know if this has been pointed out before, the note consists almost entirely of quotations from the following: 瑜伽論記 T. 1828 (XLII) 311c12-19, 312c10-12, 成唯識論述記 T. 1830 (XLIII) 272c6-15, 瑜伽論略纂 T. 1829 (XLIII) 2b3-5 (? paraphrase?), 大毘盧遮那成佛經疏 T. 1796 (XXXIX) 601c28-29, and finally two references to the first and third *juan* of the same text.

² Pradhan 1975: 338.2-20 (VI.10-11ab): *sa punar ayam aśubhām bhāvayan yogācāras trividha ucyate / ādikarmikāḥ kṛtaparijāyo 'tikrāntamanaskāras ca / ... aśubhām bhāvayitukāma ādito yogācārah / svāṅgāvayave cittaṁ nibadhnāti pādāṅguṣṭhe lalāṭe yatra cāsyābhiratiḥ / sa tatra māmsakledapītādhi-mokṣakrameṇāsthiviśodhayan sakalāmasthisamkalām paśyati / tathaiva ca punar dvitīyām adhimucyate yāvad vihārāramakṣetrakrameṇa samudraparyantāṁ pṛthivīm asthisamkalām pūrṇām adhimucyate 'dhimokṣābhivardhanārtham / punaś ca samkṣipan yāvad ekām eva svām asthisamkalām adhimucyate cittasamkṣepārtham / iyatā kila kālenāśubhā pariniṣpannā bhavati / ayam ādikarmiko yogācārah / ... sa punaḥ cittasamkṣepaviśeṣārtham tasyām asthisamkalāyām pādāsthīni hitvā śeṣaṁ manasikaroti / evaṁ krameṇa yāvat kapālasyardham hitvā 'rdham manasikaroti yaḥ sa kṛtaparijāyah / ... so 'rdham api kapālasya muktivā bhruvor madhye cittaṁ dhārayati / ayam kilāśubhāyām atikrāntamanaskāro yogācārah /*

For a French translation, see La Vallée Poussin 1923-31: vi.150-51. This passage is commented upon in the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* T. 1545 (XXVII) 205b10ff. See below for Yaśomitra's remarks.

³ See BHSD s.v. *parijaya*.

those beings in monasteries, retreats, and towns, zealously applying his attention to the earth, surrounded by the sea, as fully a collection of bones, in order to extend his zealous application of attention. And again, he contracts [his attention] until he zealously applies his attention to himself alone as a collection of bones, in order to concentrate his mind. After so much time, [the contemplation on] impurity will come to be perfected. This is the beginner *yogācāra*.

And again, in order to further concentrate his mind he takes the bones of the feet of that collection of bones and contemplates it especially. Thus the one who, until by degrees taking half of the skull contemplates the half of it, is a master.

And again, contemplating the half skull, one places his attention between the eyebrows. This is the *yogācāra* who is an absolute master of mental reflection on impurity.

Yaśomitra's commentary does not add much to the above discussion.¹ It is clear that in this conception of the *yogācāra*, he is a meditator who devotes himself to cultivation of the contemplation of the impure. It is not specified, however, whether this should be treated as a vocational designation.

In Xuanzang's translation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* passage just quoted, the three types of *yogācāra* are rendered with two terms 瑜伽師 and 觀行者.² While in general Xuanzang is among the more consistent of the Chinese translators, even sometimes to the extent of sacrificing clarity for consistency,³ we see that this is not always and universally the case. As another possible example of a certain inconsistency in Xuanzang's translations, we may refer to his translation of the *Mahāyānasamgraha*. At

¹ Shastri 1971: 896-97: *atra samāsato 'śubhāyām vartamāno yogācāras trividhaḥ — ādikarmikāḥ kṛtaparijayaḥ atikrāntamanasikāraś ca / tatra saṃkṣepacitta ādikarmiko yogācāra ekasmin pādāṅguṣṭhe mana upanibadhya pādāṅguṣṭhaṁ klidyamānaṁ paśyati / etanmāṁsam evaṁ yāvat sarvaṁ śarīraṁ asthiśaṅkalam adhimucyate / kṛtaparijayas tu tathaiva yāvat kapālārdham / atikrāntamanasikāras tathaiva yāvad bhrūvor madhye cittam dhārayati / vistaracittas tu āsamudrāsthivistāraḥ saṃkṣepād ādikarmikāḥ ity evaṁ ādis trividha iti.*

² T. 1558 (XXIX) 117c1-3. But note that at 151c5 瑜伽師 renders *yogin*.

³ See the remarks of Nagao 1994: Lxi, xiv.

I.60 we find, once each in prose and in verse, 瑜伽師, and once in verse 瑜伽者. At II.11 we find once, in verse, 觀者. All of these terms refer, according to the Tibetan translation, to *rnal 'byor pa* = **yogin*.¹ It is, of course, not absolutely certain that the occurrence in prose of 瑜伽師 could not refer to an original **yogācāra*, and the different rendering in verse could have been intended to differentiate the rendering from that of *yogin*, a form suggested as more likely by metrical constraints (it being less likely that a form in four syllables would be used when an equivalent in two was available). While it is, then, possible that Xuanzang was indeed entirely systematic and virtually mechanical in his renderings, there must remain some doubt as the present examples indicate.

Another source in which we find considerable discussion of the *yogācāra* is the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*. The occurrences of the term in this text have been extensively studied by Nishi Giyū, and perhaps more accessibly for Western scholars, noted by Ron Davidson in his doctoral dissertation.² Davidson suggests that in almost all the occurrences of the term *yogācāra* in the *Mahāvibhāṣā* it means “master meditator,” though he also adduces three cases in which he suggests it refers to the Yogācāra-Vijñāna-vāda school.³ In another treatise, this time belonging to the Mahāyāna, we find a definition of **yogācārya* (probably not *yogācāra*) in the *Cheng Weishi lun shuji* 成唯識論述記 of Kuiji 窺基.⁴ In an interesting discussion, the two possible analyses of the

¹ Actually, the verse occurrence of 瑜伽師 in I.60 is not confirmed by Tibetan, since this verse is not found in the Tibetan translation. See Nagao 1982: 261, note 5. My remarks here on the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* are based on the texts found in Nagao 1982. See now also Nagao 1994, s.v. *yogin*.

² Nishi 1939, 1974. Davidson 1985: 128 offers the following references: T. 1545 (XXVII) 38b25-27, 47a22, 205b11, 223c14, 237a27, 238c19-21, 276a10, 316c-318a, 338b-339a, 341a15-16, 422b6, 423b1, 433a3, 433b2, 439b11-12, 512c28, 527c16-20, 528a14, 529b1-6, 533a29-b8, 534a20, 536a29, 537b6, 704c1-705b11, 766b2-24, 816c1-3, 832a22, 834c11, 840a1-13, 842b4, 879c23-26, 880b14, 898a7, 899b8, 905b10-18, 938b14-22, 939a27-28, 940a3. He also refers to the *Samgītiparyāya* T. 1536 (XXVI) 446a1.

³ Davidson 1985: 128. The three cases in which the term refers to the school he locates as T. 1545 (XXVII) 815c11, 682b2, 795c9-12.

⁴ T. 1830 (XLIII) 272c6-14. I do not understand why La Vallée Poussin 1928-29 I.46, note 1, in reference to this passage says that “Kuiji signals the variant *Yogācāra*.” I think the correct interpretation is

compound are explained: “‘A master of *yoga*’ is a *taṭpuruṣa* compound. ‘A master who possesses *yoga*’ is called a *yogācārya*; this is a *bahuvrīhi* compound.”¹ The reason I suggest that this must refer to *yogācārya* is that I do not see how one could translate *yogācāra* as a *taṭpuruṣa* with 瑜伽師. While surely the term appears in many other Mahāyāna treatises as well, we can only note one or two here. In the portion of the *Śrāvaka-bhūmi* published by Wayman, we find the word several times. In the fourth *Yogasthāna* the term *yogācāra* seems to be used synonymously with *yogin*, and the specification *ādikarmika yogācāra* is found.² The fact that this term refers to one involved in mental, meditative cultivation is made clear in a subsequent passage.³ The term also appears in Sanskrit in the *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā*, but its meaning there is not clear to me.⁴

An interesting series of occurrences of the term *yogācāra* is found in the *Śrāvaka-bhūmi* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, fortunately preserved in Sanskrit.⁵ The term occurs in a lengthy quotation from what is apparently an as yet unidentified sūtra source.⁶ The term

given the expression by Miyamoto 1932: 780-81. Mukai 1978: 268, however, seems to take it as *yogācāra*. The passage is commenting on *Cheng Weishi lun* T. 1585 (XXXI) 4b29, 瑜伽師, which La Vallée Poussin has rendered as *Yogācārya*. It is true that Kuiji’s text is not Indian but Chinese, but it is well-known that he has transmitted many Indian ideas, and thus I cite the present passage although its provenance is not, strictly speaking, Indian.

¹ 瑜伽之師即依士釋。師有瑜伽名瑜伽師即有財釋。 The *bahuvrīhi* is especially hard to understand in its Chinese guise. See also T. 1832 (XLIII) 696a14-15. I think we must assume that 瑜伽之師 as a *taṭpuruṣa* is intended to refer to a compound analyzed as <*yogasya* + *ācārya*. The *bahuvrīhi* reading of 師有瑜伽, on the other hand, could support *yogācāra*, which as a *bahuvrīhi* certainly means 瑜伽師, but for the 師. If we understand this as one of the members of the compound, it rules out *ācāra*. This leads us to the conclusion that here too *yogācārya* is intended, even as a *bahuvrīhi* (?). This argument assumes of course some knowledge of Sanskrit grammar on the part of Kuiji, and his ability to gloss the compound differently if he understood it differently. That is, it assumes that he could have chosen another word for his gloss more appropriate than 師 if he meant to point to *ācāra*, not *ācārya*.

² Wayman 1961: 125, and see also Shukla 1973: 437.

³ Wayman 1961: 130, and see also Shukla 1973: 470.

⁴ Yamaguchi 1934: 156.15.

⁵ I refer to the critical edition of Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese (with German translation) in Sakuma 1990. For the Sanskrit see also the editio princeps of Shukla 1973: 197-200.

⁶ See Sakuma 1990: i.16. He refers there to Shukla 1973: 197, note 1. A possibility to be kept in mind is that the author(s) or compiler(s) of the *Yogācārabhūmi* may have made up the sūtra reference him-

here is juxtaposed with *bhikṣu* and *yogin* in one set expression, *bhikṣur yogī yogācārah*.¹

It is clear from the context that the monk who is a *yogin* and *yogācāra* (Tibetan supports the understanding of the expression as an appositional phrase) is considered to be one engaged in meditative cultivation. The apparent quotation begins:²

In how many ways, Reverend, does a monk who is a *yogin* and
yogācāra fix his mind on an object? On what object does he fix his mind?
And how is his mind fixed, firmly fixed, on its object? ... Now, Revata, if a

or them-selves as a way of legitimating his or their ideas. (Note that there is actually no reference to a *sūtra* in Sanskrit, Tibetan or Chinese. The Sanskrit begins: *yathoktaṁ bhagavatā āyusmantam revatam ārabhya*. The implication, however, is that the following was spoken in a *sūtra*.) In regard to the source of the quotation, although the case is obviously quite different and the evidence as yet weak, we should recall Nagao's discussion concerning the **Abhidharma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, quoted often in the works of Asaṅga. Nagao 1982: 28-33 considers in detail the facts concerning this **Abhidharma-mahāyāna-sūtra*, concluding (p. 33) in a cautious manner, but clearly implying that the author of the "quoted" passages may well have been Asaṅga himself. Notice that our "sūtra quotation" has been studied from an entirely different point of view by Schmithausen 1976: 239-42. Schmithausen does not mention any doubts about the authenticity of the source, merely referring to it as "an unknown Sūtra." Davidson 1985 seems to assume that what he calls the **Revatasūtra* is a legitimately old work, as he cites it together with the Aṣṭa and KP. And on p. 131 he makes his assumption explicit by calling it "probably the oldest *sūtra* base for the doctrine of *āśraya-parivṛtti* under the guise of *āśraya-viśuddhi*." At 194, note 9 he says "The actual title of this *sūtra* is unknown, but Revata as a figure and the material in this *sūtra* appear to have been specific sectarian developments within the Kashmir-Gandhāra area."

¹ I do not think this form is invariant, however, and wonder whether we must agree with Sakuma 1990: ii.9 note 43 (§ A.2.1) who restores *yogī*, missing in the Sanskrit manuscript and Tibetan translation. He claims that it is found in the Chinese translation, which has 比丘勤修觀行是瑜伽師, its habitual translation of the complete set *bhikṣur yogī yogācārah*. In other nearby passages, *yogin* alone is regularly rendered 修觀行者. While it is therefore not unlikely that the Chinese text does in fact represent the whole phrase, the entire question is a relatively minor one, and especially in view of this, given the agreement of the Tibetan translation with the Sanskrit text, I would prefer not to emend the latter solely on the basis of the Chinese.

² Sakuma 1990: ii.9-10 (§ A.2.1-2): *kiyātā bhadanta bhikṣur yogācāra ālambane cittam upanibadhnāti / katamasminn ālambane cittam upanibadhnāti / katham punar ālambane cittam upanibaddham sūpanibaddham bhavati / ... iha Revata bhikṣur yogī yogācārah caritam vā viśodhayitukāmaḥ kauśalyam vā kartukāmaḥ āsravebhyo vā cittam vimocayitukāmaḥ anurūpe cālambane cittam upanibadhnāti pratirūpe ca samyag eva copanibadhnāti tatra cānirākr̥tadhyāyī bhavati /*. The corresponding Tibetan text is found on pages 43-44, Chinese on 79-80. Sakuma offers the following translation (pages 105-106): "Auf wieviele [Weisen] (oder: Aufgrund von wieviel[en Motiven(?)]) fixiert der Yoga-Praxis übende Mönch seinen Geist auf den [Übungs]gegenstand? Auf welchen [Übungs]gegenstand fixiert er seinen Geist? Wie, ferner (oder: andererseits), muss der Geist auf den [Übungs]gegenstand fixiert [sein, um] gut fixiert [zu sein]? ... Wen dan ein Mönch, der ein Yogin ist, der die Yoga-Praxis übt, sein Verhalten läutern, Versiertheit erwerben oder seinen Geist von den "üblen Einflüssen" befreien will, so fixiert er seinen Geist auf den (jeweils) angemessenen [Übungs]gegenstand, auf der richtigen Weise, und ist unermüdlich der darauf [gerichteten] versenkungsmässigen Betrachtung gewidmet."

monk who is a *yogin* and *yogācāra* wants to purify his practice, or wants to produce good, or wants to free his mind from the depravities, and he fixes his mind on a suitable object, and fixes it exactly correctly on a corresponding [object], then he is a meditator unobscured with respect to that [object].

It is clear from this and the following passages that the *yogācāra* monk here, who is considered simultaneously to be a *yogi*, is a meditator. This is quite in concert with what other sources suggest.

Finally, before we turn to an examination of late Pāli materials, we may note one more interesting occurrence of the Sanskrit term. It is hard to know exactly where in our survey to enter the next passages, but we find in Aśvaghoṣa's *Saudarananda* XIV.19 the following:¹ "So the *yogācāra* gives food to his body only in order to suppress hunger, not out of lust or fondness for it." And again, in XV.68:² "Just as here in this world a smith melts in a fire gold, pure through progressive washings with water, separated from its impurities, and smelts it repeatedly, just so here in this world the skilled *yogācāra*, separated from his faults, purified of his defilements, calms and concentrates his mind." As these passages, and more generally speaking the meditative stance of Aśvaghoṣa, are at present being studied by my friend Nobuyoshi Yamabe, I will not further investigate the matter here.

I mentioned above that in late Pāli we find a term which appears to be equivalent or parallel to *yogācāra*, namely *yogāvacara*. If the two terms are to be considered equivalent, as they appear to be at least roughly in meaning, I still do not know exactly how to explain their phonological relation.³ Perhaps the most important occurrences of

¹ Text from Johnston 1928. In addition, my translation is indebted to that of Johnston 1932. *yogācāras tathāhāraṃ śarīrāya prayacchati / kevalaṃ kṣudvighātārthaṃ na rāgeṇa na bhaktaye //*. I do not know the force of *bhakti* here.

² *krameṇādbhiḥ śuddhaṃ kanakam iha pāmsuavyavahitaṃ yathāgnau karmāraḥ pacati bhr̥ṣam āvartayati ca / tathā yogācāro nipuṇam iha doṣavyavahitaṃ viśodhya kleṣebhyaḥ śamayati manaḥ samikṣipati ca //*.

³ That is, how do we explain the morphological link between *yogāvacara* and *yogācāra*? Note,

the term in Pāli are found in the *Milindapañha*:¹ Milinda asks about the characteristic marks (*lakkhana*) of concentrated mental application (*manasikāra*). Nāgasena answers with an analogy to a reaper of barley, saying that as the reaper of barley grabs the sheaves and cuts them off with a sickle, “just so the *yogāvacara* grasps the mind with concentrated mental application and cuts off the defilements with wisdom.”²

Other passages further clarify the term’s meaning:³ “Just so, great king, a *yogin*, *yogāvacara*, spreading out his hide sitting mat anyplace at all, whether it be on a grass covering, on a leaf covering, on a wooden bed, or on the bare ground, should lie down anywhere at all, but should not rest there long.” And further:⁴ “Just so, great king, a *yogin*, *yogāvacara*, controlling and disciplining his mind, day and night constantly and continuously with attention and correct concentrated mental application must control his mind.”

With regard to these passages, T. W. Rhys Davids has observed:⁵

Yogāvacaro; one of the technical terms in constant use by our author, but not found in the Pāli Piṭakas.... Literally it is ‘he whose sphere, whose constant resort is Yoga.’ Now yoga is ‘diligence, devotion, mental concentration;’ and there is nothing to show that our author is using the word as an

however, the remarks in von Hinüber 1986 § 145 on *avā > ā*.

¹ *Milindapañha* 32.28-33.8. The crucial sentence reads: *evam eva kho mahārāja yogāvacaro manasikārena mānasam gahetvā paññāya kilese chindati*.

² It is interesting to note the Chinese translations, in which the term is interpreted apparently differently than in most other Chinese materials. T. 1670 (A) (XXXII) 697a22 has the equivalent 智慧之人, T. 1670 (B) (XXXII) 707b19 has 智慧之人. The exact sense of the term is not so clear at 43.10, where the *yogāvacara* is said to extinguish the defilements of the five senses as people put out a fire. Here the Chinese translation T. 1670 (B) (XXXII) 709b12 has 道人. (The whole passage is missing in T. 1670 [A].) Demiéville 1925: 119, note 2, remarks that the translation 道人 corroborates Rhys Davids’s interpretation of *yogāvacara* as an ascetic, as opposed to the opinion of La Vallée Poussin (see below).

³ *Milindapañha* 366.1-4: *evam eva kho mahārāja yoginā yogāvacarena tiṇasanthāre pi paṇṇasanthāre pi kaṭṭhamañcake pi chamāya pi yattha kaṭṭhaci cammakhaṇḍam pattharivā yattha kaṭṭhaci sayitabbam na sayanabahulena bhavitabbam*. I follow CPD s.v. in rendering *kaṭṭhamañcaka* as “wooden bed,” rather than Horner’s (1964: 231) “bed of sticks.”

⁴ *Milindapañha* 378.24-26: *evam eva kho mahārāja yoginā yogāvacarena cittaṃ niyāmayamānena rattindivam satatam samitam appamattena yoniso manasikārena cittaṃ niyāmetabbam*.

⁵ Rhys Davids 1890: i.68, note 1.

epithet of Arhantship. It seems to me, therefore, that the whole compound merely means one of those 'religious,' in the technical sense, who were also religious in the higher, more usual sense. It would thus be analogous to the phrase *sarīgāmāvacāro*, 'at home in war,' used of a war elephant in the *Sarīgāmāvacāra Jātaka*

He latter added the following:¹ "[The author of the *Milinda*] means the Buddhist Bhikshu belonging to that class among the Bhikshus (by no means the majority) who had devoted themselves to a life of systematic effort according to the Buddhist scheme of self-training." Rhys Davids seems to be suggesting, then, that the term *yogāvacara* refers to a full-time vocation, as it were, rather than a role a given monk might be playing at some point in time. Let us look at some other instances of the term in Pāli.

In the *Visuddhimagga* the word appears several times. Once a hunter wants to catch a monkey in the forest: the mind is like the monkey, and the *yogāvacara* like the hunter. It is important to note that in the next expression, *yogāvacara* is replaced by *yogin*, with which it is perhaps considered to be equivalent.² In another passage virtually the same architecture is found, with the *yogāvacara* compared to the alms beggar; here too *yogāvacara* is treated as equivalent to *yogin*.³ In another passage we find an equivalent to the terminology we encountered in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, *ādikammiko yogāvacaro*. The passage reads:⁴

It is not possible for a beginner *yogāvacaro* to accomplish transformation by supernormal power unless he has previously completed his development by controlling his mind in these fourteen ways [through the kasina meditations].

¹ Rhys Davids 1894: ii.279, note 2.

² *Visuddhimagga* VIII.69.

³ *Visuddhimagga* VIII.71.

⁴ *Visuddhimagga* XII.8. *imehi pana cuddasahi ākārehi cittaṃ aparidametvā pubbe abhāvitabhāvano ādikammiko yogāvacaro iddhivikubbanam sampādessatī ti n'etaṃ thānam vijjati*. The translation is that of Ñāṇamoli 1956: 411, somewhat modified.

One set of passages also from the *Visuddhimagga* seems to use *yogāvacara* in the sense merely of “spiritual seeker,” without any specific and necessary reference to meditative cultivation.¹ The commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*, the *Atthasālinī*,² also refers to the term *ādikammiko yogāvacaro*, “beginner *yogāvacara*.” Another passage has “gentle sons [who are] *yogāvacaras*,” *yogāvacarakulaputtā*, compared to *paccantavāsino amaccā*, “frontier-dwelling ministers.”³ We also find:⁴ “With pure mind the gentle son who is a *yogāvacaro* gives a gift, undertakes the precepts, carries out the ecclesiastical acts of the fortnightly meeting, and engages in [mental] cultivation.” And again, “As an old, broken-down house stands with the support of temporary props, just so the *yogāvacaro* being propped up with the prop of energy (*virīya*) does not disregard or neglect all good teachings.”⁵ In the *Paramatthajotikā* commentary to the *Khuddakapāṭha*, *yogāvacara* refers to one who mentally contemplates various mental objects.⁶

In the important commentary on the Vinaya, the *Samantapāsādikā*, we find the following:⁷ “When a *yogāvacara* Bhikkhu has taken to meditation and when he has attained the Fourth trance in *Ānāpāna*, he takes the same as his basic ground and further contemplates upon suffering, voidness and absence of self. When he has done this he

¹ *Visuddhimagga* XXI.103-108. Other passages which employ the term include XX.123 and XXIII.46.

² *Atthasālinī* 187.15.

³ *Atthasālinī* 246.3

⁴ *Atthasālinī* 119.14-16: *pasannena cittena yogāvacaro kulaputto dānaṃ deti sīlaṃ samādiyati uposathakammaṃ karoti bhāvanam ārabhati.*

⁵ *Atthasālinī* 120.27-30: *yathā hi jīṇṇagharakaṃ āgantukena thūṇupatthambhena tiṭṭhati evam eva yogāvacaro viriyūpatthambhena upatthambhito hutvā sabbakusaladhammehi na hāyati na parihāyati.*

⁶ *Paramatthajotikā* I, Smith 1915: 74.14-75.2.

⁷ Rendered from the Chinese translation by Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 295-6. The Chinese text is T. 1462 (XXIV) 745c12-15: 若禪比丘取此定已阿那波那第四禪定作已而取爲地。復觀苦空無我觀已得阿羅漢果。是故佛爲諸禪人現阿蘭若住處。 This corresponds to the Pāli (Takakusu and Nagai 1927: ii.406,11-16): *agāmake pana araṇṇe sukaraṃ yogāvacarena idaṃ kammaṭṭhānaṃ pariggahetvā ānāpānacetutthajjhānaṃ nibbattetvā tad eva ca pādakaṃ katvā saṅkhāre sammasitvā aggaphalaṃ arahattaṃ sampāpunituṃ tasmāssa anurūpaṃ senāsanaṃ dassento bhagavā araṇṇagato vā ti ādim āha.*

attains the fruit of Arhatship. Therefore, the Tathāgata has directed, for those who want to attain trances, [the] forest as their place of residence.” Here the Chinese has rendered *yogāvacara bhikkhu* with 禪比丘.¹ The term occurs elsewhere in post-canonical Pāli as well.² While there is, then, some evidence that Chinese translators understood *yogāvacara* as they did *yogācāra*, in other cases, we would be hard pressed to determine whether a given Chinese term might, possibly, correspond with the term *yogāvacara*. In his Sanskrit, and subsequent English, translations of the **Satyasiddhiśāstra*, N. Aiya-swami Sastri has used the term *yogāvacara*.³ However, in the Chinese text from which Sastri has worked we have only 行者.⁴ It is virtually impossible to conclusively suggest what this might represent, but even *yogācāra* is in any case not likely, and *yogāvacara* almost certainly impossible if the text was originally written in Sanskrit.

We will return below to an interesting suggestion concerning the form *yogāvacara*, and its possible relation with the Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi*. Now that we have surveyed other branches of Buddhist literature, however, let us turn our attentions to the Mahāyāna sūtras. We will start with the term in the *Mahāratnakūṭa*, excluding the *Ratnarāśi*. The *Kāśyapaparivarta* has the term in two places:⁵ “when a *yogācāra* monk

¹ At 747c18 we find 坐禪比丘 used in a context of the meditative practice of counting the breath. Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 305 render *yogāvacara*, but actually there is no equivalent in the corresponding Pāli text (Takakusu and Nagai 1927: ii.419,19-20).

² For example: Jāt i.302,29-303,4: *eko kira sāvattvivāsikulaputto satthu dhammadesanāṃ sutvā ratanasāsane uraṃ datvā pubbajitvā paṭipannako yogāvacaro avissaṭṭhakammaṭṭhāno hutvā ekadivasāṃ sāvattthiyaṃ piṇḍāya caramāno ekaṃ alaṃkata paṭiyattāṃ itthiṃ disvā subhavasena indriyāni bhinditvā olokesi*. Jāt i.394,36: *...kāyagatāsati bhāvaṃ vipassakāyogāvacaro*. Jāt. 1.400, 10-11: *yathā muhattam pi bahiddhā gocare na vikkhipati yathā [read tathā?] paṇḍito yogāvacaro rakkheyya gopāyeyya*. Jāt. iii.241,9-11: *yathā hi udakam tarantaṃ laggāpentī tathā saṃsārasāgaram tarantassa yogāvacarassa pañcakāmaguṇā sabbe vā pana vatthukāmakilesakāmā laggāpanavasena paṃko nāma* I have not been able to check the following references: *Sammohavinodanī* 115.22, 220.25, 228, 229.10, 258, 331; *Paṭi-sambhidāmagga* ii.26; *Kathāvatthu* Cy 32; *Dhammapada* Cy ii.12, iii.241. Note especially that the last is said to read *yogāvacarabhikkhu*.

³ The Sanskrit is in Sastri 1975: 484.13, and the English in Sastri 1978: 457.

⁴ T. 1646 (XXXII) 360a20.

⁵ §68: *yogācāro bhikṣur yad yad evāmbanāṃ manaskaroti tat sarvaṃ asya riktakam eva khyāti (*tucchaka, sūnyatā, asāraka)*. The last three terms are suggested on the basis of the Tibetan, as the

contemplates any object whatsoever, all of them appear to him absolutely void. They appear hollow, empty, without essence.” And again:¹ “everywhere a yogācāra monk sees perturbations of mind, he practices in order to hold them in check. He holds his mind in check in such a way that it never again leaps out of control.” The Chinese versions have a variety of renderings, none of which are particularly helpful to us in determining the meaning of the word.² The term is not remarked on in the commentary, but it is clear that the reference is to meditative cultivation. In a passage from the *Bhadrāmāyākāravākyāraṇa*, the term seems to refer more generally to practitioners, without any specification of their practice:³

Bhadra. These four things are the bodhisattva mahāsattva’s generation of incorrect aspiration, which must be eliminated. What are the four? 1) To be frightened by the fear of saṃsāra. 2) To not have faith (**adhimuktī*) in *yogācāras*. 3) To not take delight in the secret meaning (**abhiprāya*?). 4) Not to accumulate the roots of good (**kuśalamūla-anabhisamkāra*).

In the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* we find a list of, for lack of a better term, “vocations” of monks. This list will be discussed again below in our investigation of monastic administration, but for the present we are interested in the appearance of the term *yogācāra*. The Tibetan version lists the “vocations” as: **bahuśrūtya*, *dharmabhāṇaka*, *vinayadhara*, *mātrkādhara*, *bodhisattvapīṭakadhara*, *āraṇyaka*, *paiṇḍapātika*, *pāṃśu-*

quotations of the passage, which is missing in the KP Sanskrit manuscript, do not contain the sentence.

¹ §108: *yogācāro bhikṣur yatra yatraiva cittasya vikāram paśyati tatra tatraivāśya nigrāhāya pratipadyate sa tathā tathā cittam nigrhṇāti yathā na puna prakupyate.*

² T. 351 (Jin): §68, §108 修行比丘; T. 659 (Mandalasena): §68 行道沙門, §108 行者; T. 310 (Qin): §68 行道比丘, §108 行者; T. 352 (Song): §68 相應行比丘, §108 相應比丘.

³ Régamey 1938a: §102: *bzang po bzhi po / 'di dag ni byang chub sems pa rnams kyi tshul bzhiṅ ma yin pa'i sems skye ba zlog par bya ba yin te / bzhi gang zhe na / 'khor ba'i 'jigs pas skrag pa dang / rnal 'byor spyod pa dag la ma mos pa / dgongs pa dag la mi dga' ba dang / dge ba'i rtsa ba rnams mngon par 'du mi byed pa ste /* (The text is from Régamey’s edition, but the translation is my own.) The Chinese at T. 310 (XI) 490c9-10 has item 2 as 於所修行不生信受. I am not sure, but in T. 324 (XII) 35b8 item 3 seems to correspond: 於安隱無所造立. I say this not because I understand this expression, but only because I suspect that 安隱 is meant for *yogakṣema*. If *adhimukti* is here at all, I cannot detect it, and by the same token I have no suggestion for the meaning of 所造立.

kūlika, alpeccha, samtuṣṭa, pravivikta, yogācāra, dhyānin, bodhisattvayānika, navakarmika, vaiyāprtyakara, and dpon sna byed pa. The last item is unclear, and will be discussed below. For our purposes it is enough to note that *yogācāra* and *dhyānin* are clearly distinguished, at least in the Tibetan version of this list.¹ Finally, the twenty-eighth text of the collection, the *Viradattagrhapatiparipṛcchā*, proclaims one of its alternate titles to be **bodhisattvayogācārabhūmi*.²

Such references are not, of course, limited to the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. In both the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* and *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* we find in almost identical words the following passage:³ “By way of example, Kauśika: When a *yogācāra* monk has arisen from meditative trance, since his mind is saturated with concentrated attention, he does not feel a strong attraction to food; his thoughts about food are few.” Haribhadra commenting on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* says: “*yogācāra* means chiefly devoted to the practice of a specific meditative trance.” Here the Chinese translations of the sūtra are interesting: Lokakṣema renders 比丘得禪.⁴ Zhi Qian has just 比丘.⁵ Kumārajīva has both 坐禪比丘 and 比丘坐禪從禪定起.⁶ Xuanzang

¹ The Tibetan is found at Peking zhi 317b5-7 = Derge nga 274a5-7 = sTog ca 28a7-b3, the Chinese at T. 310 (IX) 477a1-4, T. 322 (XII) 19a28-b3, T. 323 (XII) 27a20-25, T. 1521 (XXVI) 63a2-8. A very helpful comparative list of the three Chinese translations of the sūtra, the quotation in the **Daśabhūmivibhāṣa*, and the Tibetan translation is found in Hirakawa 1990: 130-1. The text is translated in Sakurabe 1974: 278, and Schuster 1976: 1.225-7. The Han dynasty translation of the sūtra has 思惟者和道行者, corresponding I suspect to the two terms *yogācāra* and *dhyāyin*, in reverse order, while Saṅghavarman has, respectively, 修行 and 坐禪. Dharmarakṣa and the **Daśabhūmivibhāṣa* both have only 坐禪者 in the place of the two terms.

² The Tibetan (Peking zi, 211b4, sTog ca, 349a3) has *byang chub sems dpa'i [sTog dpa'] rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa stan pa [sTog bsnyan for stan]*. Chinese versions have (T. 310 [XI] 543a17-18) 菩薩瑜伽師地, and (T. 331 [XII] 70b27) 菩薩瑜伽師地法門.

³ *Aṣṭa*: Mitra 92 = Wogihara 262.15-17: *tad yathāpi nāma kauśika bhikṣur yogācārasya samādher vyutthitasya manasikārapariśyanditena cittena na balavaty āhāre grddhir bhavati / mṛdukā cāsyāhārasamjñā bhavati /*. Haribhadra has: *yogācārasyeti samādhiviśeṣānuṣṭhānaparasya / samādhiviśeṣa* may also mean “the most excellent meditative trance.” *Pañcaviṃśati*: Kimura 1986: 86.26-28: *tad yathāpi nāma kauśika yogācārasya bhikṣoḥ samādher vyutthitasya manasikārasamtarpitena cittena na balavaty āhāre grddhir bhavati /*.

⁴ T. 224 (VIII) 435b22 = T. 226 (VIII) 517b9.

⁵ T. 225 (VIII) 485b4.

renders 瑜伽師入勝妙定.¹ And *Dānapāla has 修相應行苾芻,² while *Mokṣala offers 習行比丘.³ We see some interesting choices here. While Lokakṣema appears to have struggled with the term, ending up with “a monk who has attained concentration,” Zhi Qian has avoided the issue altogether, rendering merely “monk.” Kumārajīva offers what in some contexts at least, such as that of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, is the standard rendering, “meditating / meditation monk,” while Xuanzang has also given what is apparently his set translation. *Mokṣala has merely “the monk who cultivates practice,” while the latest, Song dynasty, translation, has gone the farthest, rendering “the monk engaged in yogic practice.” The Chinese translations of the two sūtras (or two versions of the same sūtra?) generally agree well. It is possible that the translators of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, who worked shortly after the time of Kumārajīva, adopted the rendering selected by him. I do not know if there are any studies of the translation equivalents in the Chinese Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, and whether or not on the whole these agree with the terminology found in the works of Kumārajīva.

Even the renderings of Kumārajīva himself, however, are not consistent. In the Sanskrit *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* we find the following:⁴ “Those monks and nuns, male

⁶ The former at T. 227 (VIII) 545a15-16, the latter at T. 223 (VIII) 290a15-16. Is the wording in the latter perhaps a misprint or miscopy? It is hard to imagine what could be intended here by 比丘坐禪, while 坐禪比丘 would be easily understandable.

¹ T. 220 (2) (VII) 161b1-2 = T. 220 (4) (VII) 781a20 = T. 220 (5) (VII) 877b14. Compare also in Xuanzang's work T. 220 (VII) 1016c20-22: 如瑜伽師欲證實際欣樂趣入正性離生若貪瞋癡遇緣現起令能引發阿羅漢心有障礙漸微漸遠是故說爲非理作意.

² T. 228 (VIII) 601b18-19.

³ T. 221 (VIII) 51a22.

⁴ SP 6.12: *ye ca teṣu buddhakṣetreṣu bhikṣubhikṣuṇyupāsakopāsikā yogino yogācārāḥ prāptaphalāś cāprāptaphalāś ca te 'pi* (Kashgar and Gilgit are identical.) Tibetan: *sangs rgyas kyi zhing de dag na dge slong dang dge slong ma dang / dge snyen dang / dge bsnyen ma dang / rnal 'byor can dang / rnal 'byor spyod pa gang dag 'bras bu thob pa dang / 'bras bu ma thob pa de dag ...* The syntax of the Sanskrit has been understood strangely in Matsunami et al. 1975: 12: それらの仏陀の国土には比丘・比丘尼、信男・信女の修行者たちがいて、瑜伽行を修め、その結果を得たものもあれば、まだ得ないものもあるが.... I frankly think this cannot be correct. Note that the Tibetan translation does not support this rendering. Compare the renderings in Burnouf 1852: 4, and Kern 1884: 7.

and female lay disciples, *yogins* and *yogācāras*, who had attained the fruit and who had not attained the fruit, in those buddha fields” The Chinese translation of Kumārajīva has, corresponding to *yogino yogācārāḥ prāptaphalāś cāprāptaphalāś ca*, 諸修行得道者。¹ It is at least possible that this should be understood as more or less equivalent to *yogācārāḥ* and *prāptaphalāḥ*, although a recent English rendering has more naturally understood the phrase as one expression: “those who had practised and achieved the path.”²

The *Brahmaviśeṣacintipariṣcchā* contains another reference to the *yogācāra* in a widely quoted passage:³

¹ T. 262 (IX) 2b21. Exactly the same is found at T. 264 (IX) 135b28.

² Kubo and Yuyama 1991: 3. It is also so understood by Watson 1993: 6, “who had carried out religious practices and attained the way.”

Dharmarakṣa’s version, T. 263 (IX) 63c12-13, has: 修行獨處者速得德果一切表露。This may not be absolutely clear (I do not understand 表露), but in any case *yogin* and *yogācārā* seem to have been understood as 修行獨處者, a translation which we might have understood otherwise as equivalent to *yogācāra* and **āranyaka*.

³ In his edition of the first *bam po* of the sūtra, Kiyotaka Goshima has traced multiple quotations of the passage. According to his unfortunately not very accessible edition, Goshima 1981: 31-32, and appendix page 9-13, the passage is found in various Tibetan versions as follows: Cone 800 *ba* 39a, Derge 160 *ba* 33b, Lhasa 161 *pa* 51b, Tōyō Bunko Manuscript 165 146b, Peking 827 *phu* 34b4, Narthang 146 *pa* 52a. The Chinese versions have the passage at T. 585 (XV) 4c7-13; T. 586 (XV) 36c28-37a4; T. 587 (XV) 66c16-21. The Sanskrit for the passage is available in the *Prasannapadā* of Candrakīrti, although quoted there under the odd name of *Tathāgatavāgguhyaparivarta* = *de bzhin gshegs pa’i gsang ba bstan pa’i le’u*. (No such name appears in the list of alternative titles found at the end of the sūtra itself.) See La Vallée Poussin 1903-13: 540.12-541.5: *tad ime bhagavan mohapuruṣā ye svākhyāte dharmavinaye pravrajya tīrthikadr̥ṣṭau nipatitā nirvāṇaṁ bhāvataḥ paryeṣate tadyathā tilebhyas tailaṁ kṣīrāt sarpiḥ / atyantapari-nirvṛteṣu bhagavan sarvadharmeṣu te nirvāṇaṁ mārganti tān aham ābhimānikān tīrthikān iti vadāmi / na bhagavan yogācārāḥ samyak pratipannaḥ kasyacid dharmasyotpādaṁ vā nirodhaṁ vā karoti nāpi kasyacid dharmasya prāptim icchati nābhisamayam iti vistaraḥ* //. The Tibetan translation of this passage is found in the Derge Tanjur 3860 *dbu ma*, ‘a, 182a1-5. According to Goshima’s edition, the passage is also found in the *Prajñāpradīpa* of Bhāvaviveka, Peking Tanjur *dbu ma*, *tsha*, 311b7-312a5, Chinese T. 1566 (XXX) 131b2-8, and in Avalokitavṛata’s *ṭīkā*: *dbu ma, za*, 360b7-361a5. In all cases the Tibetan versions of the sūtra and its quotations in the śāstras have *yogācāra samyakpratipanna* as *rnal ’byor spyod pa yang dag par zhugs pa*. The Chinese versions, however, show a considerable variation. T. 585 修行者, T. 586 and T. 587 正修道者, *Prajñāpradīpa* 成就行者. Although not mentioned by Goshima, the final portion of the quotation is also found in the 瑜伽師地論釋 T. 1580 (XXX) 884a3-6, and there the term is rendered with Xuanzang’s habitual 瑜伽師. The Tibetan equivalent is found in the *Yogcaryabhūmi-vyākhyā*, Tōh. 4043 (Derge Tanjur, *sems tsam*, ‘i, 69b4): *tshangs pas zhus pa chen po’i mdo las kyang / bcom ldan ’das rnal ’byor spyod pa’i sa la yang dag par zhugs pa ni chos gang skye ba’am ’gag par mi bgyid do zhes bya ba la sogs pa gsungs so* //. The rendering *rnal ’byor spyod pa’i sa* suggests, however, an

Those deluded people, Blessed One, who having renounced the world into the well-known community, are fallen into the speculative views of the non-Buddhists and seek nirvāṇa as a real existent, just as [one might seek to obtain] oil from sesame seeds, or ghee from milk; they are seeking, Blessed One, after nirvāṇa among all things which are already completely passed into nirvāṇa. I call those people arrogant non-Buddhists. The *yogācāra* who is correctly perfected in his practice does not cause the arising or destruction of anything at all, nor does he acknowledge the acquisition of anything, nor its comprehension.

Here it seems that the term *yogācāra* refers to the type of practitioner whose behavior and views are approved of by the authors of the sūtra. It is moreover also implied by the context that these practitioners are monks, those who have “renounced the world into the well-known community.” Another important, although I believe not early, Mahāyāna sūtra, the *Laṅkāvatāra*, has the following passage:¹

Mahāmāti, because it creates an obstacle to the perfection of spells and to liberation for those who dwell in cemeteries, and yogins,² *yogācāras*, who dwell in wilderness areas, realms frequented by demons, and border regions, who dwell in friendliness, and for the upholders of spells, those who wish to completely command spells, also observing that this causes obstruction to the perfection of all yogas of those gentle sons and gentle daughters just set out in

understanding of **yogācārābhūmi*.

¹ Nanjio 1923: 248.8-14: *śmaśānikānām ca mahāmate aranyavanaprasthāny amanuṣyāvacarāṇi prāntāni śayanāsanāny adhyāvasatām yoginām yogācārāṇām maitrīvihārīṇām vidyādharāṇām vidyā-sādhayitukāmānām vidyāsāadhanamokṣavighnakaratvān mahāyānasamprasthitānām kulaputrāṇām kuladuhitṛiṇām ca sarvayogasāadhanāntarāyakaram ity api samanupaśyatām <-āḥ?> mahāmate svaparātma-hitakāmasya māmsam sarvam abhakṣyam bodhisattvasya.*

The Tibetan text in the Derge Kanjur 107, *mdo sde*, ca, 154a6-b1, reads: *blo bros chen po dur khrod pa rnam dang / dgon pa nags 'dab mi ma yin pa rgyu ba bas ma tha'i mal stan la gnas pa'i rnal 'byor pa / rnal 'byor la spyod pa byams pa la gnas pa rnam dang / rig sngags 'chang ba / rig sngags grub par 'dod pa rnam kyi rig sngags sgrub pa dang / thar pa la bgegs byed pa'i phyir theg pa chen po la zhugs pa'i rigs kyi bu dang / rigs kyi bu mo rnam kyi rnal 'byor sgrub pa thams cad kyi bar chang byed par 'gyur bar rjes su mthong nas bdag dang gzhan gyi lus la phan par 'dod pa'i byang chub sems dpas sha thams cad mi bza'o //.*

My translation of the Sanskrit was guided by the Tibetan translation. The Chinese equivalents for *yogācāra* are quoted in Suzuki's Index as 寂靜修行, 修觀行者 and 如實行者.

² I follow the Tibetan here in inserting the conjunction; the Sanskrit appears to be appositional.

the Mahāyāna, Mahāmati, the bodhisattva who desires his own and others' benefit should not eat any meat at all.

Here again *yogācāra* seems to be virtually synonymous with yogin, and may or may not be considered as an avocation parallel to dwelling in cemeteries or dwelling in wilderness areas. I think we have virtually the same implications a bit latter the same sūtra:¹

But if, Mahāmati, it occurred to me to allow [meat-eating], or if I were to judge it as acceptable, then I would not make, would not be making, the prohibition of all meat-eating, in order to cultivate in them the idea that all beings are like their only child, for yogis, *yogācāras*, who dwell in friendliness, who dwell in cemeteries, and for gentle sons and gentle daughters who are set out in the Great Vehicle. Mahāmati, I make the prohibition on all meat in order to cultivate in gentle sons and gentle daughters who desire the teachings, who are set out in any vehicle, who dwell in cemeteries, who dwell in friendliness, who dwell in wilderness areas, who are yogins and *yogācāras*, the idea that all beings are like their only child so that they may perfect all the yogas.

The *Ratnamegha* makes some attempt to, as it were, “define” the term *yogācāra*:²

¹ Nanjio 1923: 254.8-16: *yadi tu mahānte anujñātukāmātā me syāt kalpyam vā me śrāvakāṇām pratisevitum syān nāhaṁ maitrīvihāriṇām yoginām yogācārāṇām śmaśānikāṇām mahāyānasamprasthitānām kulaputrāṇām kuladuhitṛiṇām ca sarvasattvaikaputrakasamjñābhāvanārthaṁ sarvamāmsabhakṣaṇapratiseḍham kuryām kṛtavāms ca / asmin mahāmate dharmakāmānām kulaputrāṇām kuladuhitṛiṇām ca sarvayānasamprasthitānām śmaśānikāṇām maitrīvihāriṇām āraṇyakāṇām yoginām yogācārāṇām sarvayogasādhānāya sarvasattvaikaputrakasamjñābhāvanārthaṁ sarvamāmsapratiseḍham.*

The Tibetan text in the Derge Kanjur 107, *mdo sde*, ca, 156a6-b2, reads: *blo bros chen po gal te ngas gzhang bar bya bar 'dod dam / nga'i nyan thos rnams kyis bsnyen par rung ba zhig yin na ni / byams pas gnas pa'i rnal 'byor can dur khrod pa rnams dang / theg pa chen po la yang dag par zhugs pa'i rigs kyi bu dang / rigs kyi bu mo rnams la sems can thams cad bu gcig bzhi du 'du shes bsgom pa'i phyir sha thams cad za ba gcod par yang byas so // blo gros chen po ngas ni rigs kyi bu dang rigs kyi bu no chos 'dod pa theg pa thams cad la rab tu zhugs pa rnams dang / dur khrod pa byams pa la gnas pa dgon pa pa rnal 'byor la spyod pa rnams kyi rnal 'byor thams cad sgrub pa dang sems can thams cad bu bzhi du 'du shes bsgom pa'i phyir / sha thams cad gcod par yang byas so //*

My translation of the Sanskrit was guided by the Tibetan translation. The Chinese text is found at T. 670 (XVI) 513b22-, T. 671 (XVI) 561a21, T. 672 (XVI) 622c29-

² Derge Kanjur 231, *mdo sde*, wa, 90a6-b1: *rigs kyi bu chos bcu dang ldan na byang chub sems*

Gentle son. If a bodhisattva cultivates ten types of qualities he will be a *yogācāra*. What are the ten? 1) abundantly contemplating the impure. 2) abundantly contemplating friendliness. 3) abundantly contemplating dependent co-arising. 4) being abundantly wise concerning faults.¹ 5) abundantly contemplating emptiness. 6) abundantly contemplating the signless. 7) abundantly cultivating the yoga contemplation practice. 8) continually engaging in abundant cultivation. 9) being without regrets 10) completely upholding the precepts.

Here there can be no question that it is the meditative cultivation of the *yogācāra* which is felt to define him. Perhaps something like the same implication is behind the following passage from the *Samdhinirmocana*:²

Subhūti. Again, the *yogācāra* monk, even understanding the true nature of one skandha as ultimately characterized by non-self, still does not seek out individually the ultimate characterization of absence of self of other skandhas, dhātus, āyatanas, dependent co-arising, nourishments, truths, foundations of mindfulness, exertions, bases of magical power, powers, strengths, limbs of awakening, and the eight-fold noble path. Relying on the non-dual knowledge which conforms to true reality, he ascertains and correctly understands the characteristic of the unique flavor of all ultimate

dpa' rnal 'byor spyod pa rnams yin no // bcu gang zhe na / 'di lta ste / (1) mi sdug pa bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin / (2) byams pa bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin / (3) rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin / (4) skyon la mkhas pa mang ba rnams yin / (5) stong pa nyid bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin / (6) mtshan ma med pa bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin / (7) rnal 'byor bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin / (8) rgyun tu bsgom pa mang ba rnams yin / (9) 'gyod pa med pa rnams yin / (10) tshul khrims phun sum tshogs pa rnams yin /. The Chinese versions of this passage are found as follows: T. 489 (XIV) 740b22-28, T. 658 (XVI) 232c28-233a2, T. 659 (XVI) 269b1-6, T. 660 (XVI) 318b23-29.

¹ Chinese suggests: being completely rid of all faults and transgressions.

² Lamotte 1935: IV.9: *rab 'byor gzhan yang dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa ni phung po gcig gi de bzhin nyid don dam pa'i chos bdag med pa rab tu rtogs nas yang de las gzhan pa'i phung po rnams dang / kham rnams dang / skye mched rnams dang / rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba dang / zas rnams dang / bden pa rnams dang / dran pa nye bar bzhag pa rnams dang / yang dag par spong ba rnams dang / rdzu 'phrul gyi rkang pa rnams dang / dbang po rnams dang / stobs rnams dang / byang chub kyi yan lag rnams so so dang / 'phags pa'i lam yan lag brgyad pa so so la de bzhin nyid don dam pa bdag med pa yongs su tshol bar mi byed kyi de bzhin nyid kyi rjes su 'brang ba gnyis med pa'i shes pa la rten pa de nyid kyi don dam pa thams cad du ro gcig pa'i mtshan nyid nges par 'dzin pa dang / mngon par rtogs pa kho nar byed de / rab 'byor rnam grangs des kyang khyod kyi 'di ltar thams cad du ro gcig pa'i mtshan nyid gang yin pa de don dam pa yin par rig par bya'o //*. The Chinese versions are found at T. 675 (XVI) 668c11-16, and T. 677 (XVI) 714b1-10. Both render **yogācāra bhikṣu* with 修行比丘.

truth. Subhūti. Through this teaching you must understand that what is characterized by the unique flavor of everything is the ultimate truth.

There are also a number of texts in which the term appears, but without its meaning being clear. In the *Gaṇḍavyūha* we find the expression:¹ “[The Tathāgata’s body] makes fall for the *yogācāra* bodhisattvas the rain from the cloud of the teaching which is called the cry of the origin of the intrinsic nature of all things (?).” I confess that essentially I do not understand a word of this. In the *Ratnamegha*, we find the following interesting, and somewhat more comprehensible, passage:²

Gentle son. If people are endowed with ten qualities they are noble bodhisattvas (**ājaneyabodhisattva*). What are the ten? They are [being those who]: 1) are *yogācārins* who abundantly contemplate emptiness. 2) keep to the way unceasingly, being unobscured and free of all obsessions.³ 3) follow the Tathāgata’s orders without violating them. 4) understand the equality of all things by understanding the nature of the *dharmadhātu*. 5)

¹ Suzuki and Idzumi 1949: 94.13-14: *yogācārāṇām bodhisattvāṇām sarvadharmasvabhāvatala-nirghoṣaṁ nāma dharmameghavarṣaṁ abhipravarṣamāṇān*. The Chinese versions have the critical term as T. 278 (IX) 696c18: 修行菩薩; T. 279 (X) 342a4: 修行位諸菩薩; T. 293 (X) 691c7-8: 修行相應位諸菩薩. The translation of Kajiyama et al. 1994: I,166 has avoided the problem of interpreting the difficult compound by merely quoting the rendering of T. 293. Takasaki 1974: 554, note 54 suggested that the list in which the item quoted here appears is presented in descending order of importance, namely: *bodhi-maṇḍavaragata bodhisattva*, *abhiṣekaprāpta b°*, *mahādharmauvarāṇyābhiṣeka b°*, *kumārabhūta b°*, *avivartya b°*, *śuddhādhyaśaya b°*, *pūrvayogasampanna b°*, *janmaja b°*, *yogācāra b°*, *ādikarmika b°*, *prathamaciittotpādita b°*, etc. Anyway, it must be considered not entirely clear as to meaning.

² The passage in Tibetan reads (Derge Kanjur 231, *mdo sde*, wa 58a4-7): *rigs kyi bu chos bcu dang ldan na byan chub sems dpa' cang shes rnams yin no // bcu gang zhe na / 'di lta ste / stong pa nyid la sgom pa mang bas rnal 'byor spyod pa rnams yin / sgrib pa med cing kun nas ldang ba thams cad dang bral bas lam gyi rgyun ma bcad pa rnams yin / de bzhin gshegs pa'i bka' mi gcod pas bka' bzhin byed pa rnams yin / chos kyi dbyings kyi tshul rtogs pas chos thams cad kyi tshul mnyam pa nyid khong du chud pa rnams yin / dma' ba dma' ba'i yid kyi gdol bu ltar 'jig rten na spyod pa rnams yin / rtag tu rgyun mi cad par bsod snyoms blang bar 'du shes nye bar gzhas pas nga rgyal dang / rgyags pa dang / dregs pa dang bral ba rnams yin / 'di ltar de mngon sum du sehs pa'i phyir snags rgyas kyi chos thams cad la nem nur med pa rnams yin / chos rang gis rig pa'i phyir the tsom med pa rnams yin / rang gis lam mthong bas gzhan gyis mi bkri zhing pha rol gyi dring mi 'jog pa rnams yin / rab tu zhugs pas 'jig rten na sbyin pa'i gnas su gyur pa rnams yin te / rigs kyi bu chos bcu po de dag dang ldan na byang chub sems dpa' cang shes pa rnams yin no //*. For the crucial expression *stong pa nyid la sgom pa mang bas rnal 'byor spyod pa rnams yin* the Chinese translations have: T. 660 (XVI) 305c4 得瑜伽師. T. 489 (XIV) 726c12-13: 雖修定行而常觀空. T. 659 (XVI) 257a6-7: 坐禪攝心. T. 658 (XVI) 222b18: 雖行禪定恒修空相.

³ Note Mhy. 814-815: *sarvāvaraṇavivaraṇaparyutthānavigataḥ, apratipraśrabdhamārgaḥ = sgrib pa dang chod pa dang kun nas ldang ba thams cad dang bral ba, lam gyi rgyun ma chad pa*.

move around in the world like *caṇḍālas*, with humble minds. 6) are free of arrogance, pride and haughtiness, since they have put aside notions of always and without interruption grasping for alms. 7) are free from doubt concerning all the qualities which characterize a buddha (**sarvabuddhadharma*), because they know him thus through direct perception (**pratyakṣa*). 8) are without doubt, because they comprehend things by themselves. 9) are not led by others (**ananyaneya*), not dependent on others (**aparapratyaya*), since they see the way by themselves. 10) have become fields of merit in the world because they have practiced well.¹ Gentle son. If people are endowed with those ten qualities they are noble bodhisattvas.

We may briefly remarks on some other sūtras as well. The 分別緣起初勝法門經 has:² “What is *samyak-smṛti*? The Blessed One said: Energetic cultivation of *śamatha* and *vipaśanā* (止觀). The *yogācārins* (諸瑜伽師) rely on the three signs. They always concentrate on those three signs and are not distracted and careless (*pramāda*)....” In the 一切法高王經, the inside of the palace of the Nāga king of Anavatapta is a dwelling place for meditating monks 坐禪比丘. The next sentence then states that monks with supernatural powers, possessed of power, 神通比丘有威德者 also dwell there.³ In other translations of the same sūtra the two references are rendered in one compound as 坐禪神通之人,⁴ or as 神通禪定者.⁵ It is not absolutely clear to me how the latter two expressions should be understood. One of the many powers of a *dhāraṇī* described in the *Sūryagarbhasūtra* is that it makes the *yogācāra* delight in wilderness dwelling.⁶ In the

¹ I translate this item in line with the Chinese translations. I do not understand the Tibetan translation.

² T. 717 (XVI) 843b6-9. T. 716 (XVI) 836a29 does not have the term *yogācāra*, but it is possible that 合相應 is somehow connected with it.

³ T. 823 (XVII) 854c21-22. For the second term, see Nakamura 1981: 34a.

⁴ 諸法勇王經 T. 822 (XVII) 848b8-9.

⁵ 諸法最上王經 T. 824 (XVII) 862b7.

⁶ The Tibetan is found in the Derge Kanjur 257, *mdo sde, za*, 137b7, 158a3, and 172a3 as *rnal 'byor spyod pa rnams mngon par dga' bar bgyi pa* (or: *byed pa'o*). The Chinese passages T. 397 (XIII) 250b12 and 258b22 have 坐禪人, while at 264a17 we have 坐禪行人.

Sāgaramati-sūtra we find the expression “intent stage of the practice of yoga (?**samprāyuktayogācārābhūmi*).”¹ A manuscript fragment from Turfan which appears to be from a Mahāyāna sūtra, so far unidentified, contains the term *yogācārāṇām*, but lacking virtually any context at all it is impossible to say more about its importance.²

In addition to the term *yogācāra*, we also have the compound term *yogācāra-bhūmi*. There should be no question that the latter is an important technical term, and one which appears in the *Ratnarāśi* itself. Unfortunately, its meaning is almost totally unclear. Some time ago, Luis Gómez and I snuck our way past the term with the rendering “the stage of the practice of yoga.”³ If for no other reason than that “*yogācāra-bhūmi*” is the title of a well-known and important text, the term has been discussed somewhat by scholars.⁴ Let us refer to only a few sūtra passages in which it appears. In the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* we find that “[The sacrifice of the Teaching (*dharmayajña*) is] the stage of the practice of yoga (*yogācārābhūmi*) effected by the practice (*yoga*) of liberating all beings from the defilements.”⁵ In the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, in a discussion of wisdom (*prajñā*) it is stated that “wisdom is the practice of all those dwelling in the stage

¹ Derge Kanjur 152, *mdo sde, pha*, 60a7: *yang dag par rab tu brtson pa'i rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa'o* // T. 400 (XIII) 499b13 復有一法。如理正修瑜伽行地。 In T. 397 (XIII) 61a11-12 this reads 復有一法。修善行已即住初地。

² Fragment 1197, the first side of the first folio, line 3. My attention was drawn to this fragment by my friend Nobuyoshi Yamabe, to whom I am likewise indebted for many other references on the present topic.

³ Gómez and Silk 1989: 58, translating *Samādhirāja* Dutt 1939-59: II.1: 20.12 = Matsunami 1975: 222.3. According to Murakami 1967 s.v., this is rendered in Chinese with 方便地, a term which it would be hard to understand as standing for anything other than **upāyabhūmi*, although I have never seen such a term and cannot imagine what it might mean.

⁴ See Demiéville 1954: 342-43, and the notes.

⁵ VKN III §72: (Tibetan text in Ōshika 41.4-6): *sems can thams cad nyon mongs pa las rnam par grol ba'i rnal 'byor gyis mngon par bsgrubs pa'i rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa*). Lamotte 1962: 214 renders: “la terre de la pratique du yoga (*yogācārābhūmi*) résultant des efforts tendant à libérer tous les êtres de leurs passions (*sarvasattvakleśapramocanaprayoga*).” Nagao 1974: 67 has: あらゆる人々を煩惱から解脱させる行により、現にヨーガ行の階位が成立していることです。 The Chinese translations read T 474 (XIV) 525a25-26: 爲一切勞不斷賢者行地。 T. 475 (XIV) 543c24: 解脱衆生縛起修行地。 T. 476 (XIV) 567a13-15: 以正息除一切有情煩惱行相引發善修瑜伽師地。

of the practice of yoga (*yogācārabhūmi*).” The commentary explains:¹

As for the expression ‘wisdom is the practice of all those dwelling in the stage of the practice of yoga,’ cultivating the concentration (*samādhi*) of [the contemplation on] impurity, friendliness, or dependent co-arising, and emptiness, the signless, and wishlessness is ‘the practice of yoga (*yogācāra*).’ Because of cultivating those concentrations, or on that basis, it is said with regard to ‘the stage of the practice of yoga’ that it is practice (*prayoga*) because that wisdom is the path of the practice of yoga. What sort of path? It is not possible to cultivate anything without relying on wisdom gained from hearing and wisdom gained from thinking.”

It is probably worthwhile at this juncture to emphasize the degree of instability of Chinese terminology with which we have been dealing, and the difficulty of using Chinese materials for research into Sanskrit terminology. I would like to give some examples here merely meant to illustrate that the appearance in Chinese of terms elsewhere attested as equivalents of *yogācāra* need not necessarily point to that term. For that reason the following examples are not translated.

In the *Samādhirājasūtra*, chapter 28,² *daśame kumāra ānuśāṁsā dhyānādhi-muktasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasya* ... appears in Chinese as 菩薩摩訶薩興禪相應,³ and 坐禪菩薩.⁴ Elsewhere *tuṣṭiḥ samādhisārāṇām* ... is rendered with 云何名爲修禪者猗悅.⁵ We might have been prompted to look at these Chinese renderings as

¹ The sūtra passage is found in Tibetan in Braarvig 1993: I.83,8-9: *shes rab ni rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa la gnas pa thams cad kyi sbyor ba'o*. The commentary is quoted in Braarvig 1993: II.337, note 3: *shes rab ni rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa la gnas pa thams cad kyi sbyor ba'o zhes bya ba la / mi gtsang ba'am / byams pa'am / rten cing 'brel bar 'byung ba'am / stong pa nyid dang / mshan ma med pa dang / smon pa med pa'i ting nge 'dzin bsgom pa ni rnal 'byor spyod pa'o / ting nge 'dzin de dag bsgom pa'i gryu'am / gzhi la rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa zhes bya ste / shes rab de rnal 'byor spyod pa'i lam yin pas sbyor ba'o // de yang ji ltar na lam zhe na / mnyan pa'i shes rab dang / bsam pa'i shes rab la ma brten par gang yang bsgom par mi nus so //*. Braarvig in his translation 1993: II.337 rendered *sbyor ba* with *yoga*, but I think **prayoga* is better; probably the meaning does not change.

² Dutt 1939-59: II.163.1.

³ T. 639 (XV) 584c24.

⁴ T. 640 (XV) 621a11.

⁵ Dutt 1939-59: II.302.12, rendered at T. 639 (XV) 619b5.

suggestive of an original **yogācāra* had we no Sanskrit text to which to refer. It is therefore clear that 坐禪 often does not mean *yogācāra*. In the *Śūraṅgamasamādhi*, for instance, it refers to **dhyāna*, or even **saṃkṣepa* (?).¹

A related case appears in a quotation from the *Sandhinirmocana*. The quotation contains the term 修行菩薩,² which corresponds however in the sūtra itself to *byang chub sems dpa' = bodhisattva*.³ The Chinese translations of the *Sandhinirmocana* have 菩薩,⁴ and 菩薩摩訶薩.⁵ In the *Laṅkāvatāra* we find an instance of the Chinese term which often is unequivocally equivalent to *yogācāra*, 瑜伽師.⁶ However, in the corresponding Sanskrit text, this is not the term which is actually found.⁷ The sense of people who practice yoga is certainly expressed here, but despite the appearance of the Chinese term the Sanskrit technical term with which we are concerned does not appear. In the case of the *Daśacakrakṣitigarbha*, the Tibetan translation is made from the Chinese version of Xuanzang. His translation has the expression 阿練若修定苾芻 ... 修定者,⁸ while the other Chinese version has at the same place 清淨比丘 ... 坐禪比丘.⁹ Corresponding to this in the Tibetan translation, however, we have *khyod dang bas mthar*

¹ At T. 642 (XV) 643c18-19, we have 坐禪第一如離婆多, but in the Tibetan (Derge 132, *mdo sde, da*, 305b4) *la la na ni ma gru bzhin du bsam gyan par gyur*. In other words, here 坐禪 means **dhyāna*. At 643c19-20 we have: 入諸城邑聚落乞食 ... 說法 ... 坐禪. Here the Tibetan (Derge 132, *mdo sde, da*, 305b6) indicates with ... *yang dag par 'jog par snang ste* / that the original may have been **saṃkṣepa* (?). Compare Lamotte 1975: 259-60.

² T. 847 (XVII) 959c25ff.

³ Lamotte 1935: § IX.9.

⁴ T. 678 (XVI) 715c18.

⁵ T. 675 (XVI) 681b17-18. The final version of the sūtra, T. 676 (XVI) 705a8, has a passive construction here with the subject omitted.

⁶ T. 672 (XVI) 591b24-25: 云何修行進。云何修行退。瑜伽師有幾。令人住其中。 Compare the corresponding passage in T. 671 (XVI) 520a1-2, almost identical with T. 672 except for pada c: 何因修行退。何因修行進。教何等人修。令住何等法。

⁷ Nanjio 1923: 27 (II.41): *katham vyāvartate yogāt katham yoga pravartate / katham caivamvidhā yoge narā sthāpyā vadāhi me //*.

⁸ T. 411 (XIII) 735c22, 24.

⁹ T. 410 (XIII) 693c1, 3.

*gnas shing ting nge 'dzin sgom pa'i dge slong dag gnas khang mchog dag gnas shing mal cha mchog dang / ... ting nge 'dzin sgom pa dag.*¹ In the *Ghanavyūhasūtra*, one Chinese version has the term 修觀行者,² while another has the same as 諸修習勝瑜伽者.³ The Tibetan for this expression, however, reads *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rnal 'byor dam pa'i rnal 'byor can 'di lta ste*/.⁴ The latter might suggest a form such as **paramayogin* (?).

These few examples should be enough to make us cautious about relying on Chinese translations when we are concerned not about general sense but about precise word usage.

Let us now turn to the use of the expression *yogācāra bhikṣu* in the *Ratnarāśi* itself. The term *yogācāra* appears in the *Ratnarāśi* at I.14, I.15, III.19, IV.4, VI.8. Moreover, at IV.4 we encounter the crucial term *yogācārabhūmi*. The monks characterized in the *Ratnarāśi* as *yogācāra* monks are portrayed very much in line with the picture we have drawn above, namely they are serious and intent upon their practice. It is implied, for example in IV.4, that these monks engage in meditative cultivation, and this probably can be understood to be explicitly stated in VI.8, in which we find a discussion of the importance of the first Concentration (*dhyāna*). We have every reason, therefore, to believe that the meaning of the technical term *yogācāra* is fairly standard throughout the different genres of Buddhist literature, in the meaning of those who devote especial and particular attention to meditative contemplation and cultivation.

The Chinese translation of the term in our text presents us with a very interesting problem. The Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi* and the corresponding sections of the

¹ Derge Kanjur 239, *mdo sde, zha*, 138a1-2.

² T. 681 (XVI) 723b24.

³ T. 682 (XVI) 747c28.

⁴ Derge Kanjur 110, *mdo sde, cha* 1b4.

Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* consistently render *yogācāra*, and sometimes simply *yoga*, with 離扼, that is, literally, “free from the *yogas*.” In order to understand this we have to take a look at one meaning of the word *yoga* we have not yet mentioned. The *yogas*, “yokes,” are equivalent in Buddhist philosophy to the *oghas* or “floods,” *kāma*, *bhava*, *drṣṭi* and *avidyā*.¹ While reference to this is relatively rare, the term *yoga* in the sense equivalent to *ogha* is described in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, for example.² The two *yogas* of interest to us here, then, are *yoga* as practice, and *yoga* as yoke.³ If I may offer a speculation, I think it is possible that, at some stratum of the tradition, *yoga* and *ogha* are actually the same word. It is not impossible to imagine the word *ogha* with a prefixed soft glide *y-* and a deaspiration of *-gh-*: *ogha* > **y-ogha* > *yoga*. I hasten to add that I have absolutely no evidence for this other than the following: we must account for the existence of two terms, phonologically relatively close to each other, appearing with identical meanings in bodies of literature which we know to have been translated or “massaged” from some sort of Middle Indic form. I do not know in what sort of relative distribution the two terms occur, but I have the impression that in this meaning the term *yoga* is very much the rarer.⁴ In the sense of “yoke” the standard Chinese rendering of *yoga* is 扼 (or 扼, or again 輓).

It is hard to understand how translators who were in the least familiar with

¹ See Oda 1917: 1750b, 800a, and La Vallée Poussin 1923-31: v.75.

² Pradhan 1950: 47.20-21, translated in Rahula 1980: 75: *yogaś caturvidhaḥ / kāmayogaḥ bhava-yogaḥ drṣṭiyogaḥ avidyāyogaś ca / viśaṃyogaparipanthakaro yogārthaḥ / viśuddhiviparyayataḥ / te punar yathāyogam eṣaṇātrayabhāvanā* / T. 1605 (XXXI) 677b17-19.

³ Schlingloff 1964: 29, note 1, seems to associate or even confuse the two when he says “The concept *yoga* appears in Buddhism first in its profane, and thereby for the sacred path negative, meaning,” giving then references to the sense of *yoga* as equivalent to *ogha* (which equivalence, however, he does not mention).

⁴ It is, on the other hand, extremely likely that the early Buddhist literature absorbed elements from diverse sources, or diverse traditions, and there exists therefore the strong possibility of parallel and not ultimately related traditions of terminology or ideas. If this were the case the phonological similarity between *ogha* and *yoga* would be purely adventitious, and of no historical importance.

Buddhist thought could have come up with the rendering 離扼 for *yoga* or *yogācāra*.¹ That the translators of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* came up with the same rendering as that found in the *Ratnarāśi* may safely be explained on the assumption that they consulted the earlier rendering of the sūtra itself, even though taken as whole their translations of quotations from the sūtra do not show much attention to that earlier rendering. But why would one choose such a rendering? I have not so far encountered even a folk-etymological explanation of *yogācāra* which introduces the notion of the *yogas* as “yokes,” — although we should note that in IV.4 the Chinese rendering of the *Ratnarāśi* has “monks who are free from the four *yogas*,” in other words translating **yogācāra bhikṣu* with 比丘能離四扼. One speculative but intriguing suggestion, however, is that offered by Nobuyoshi Yamabe.²

Yamabe has pointed out that two problems noticed so far might in fact be connected, namely the problem of the relation of *yogācāra* and *yogāvacara* and the problem of the rendering of *yoga* or *yogācāra* by 離扼. He thus suggested the possibility that 離扼 might represent some understanding of **yogāpacara* (**yoga* + *apacara*) < *yogāvacara*. While **yogāpacara* is so far unattested, this suggestion seems at least not completely impossible, and I have at present no other suggestion of how the term could be explained. This explanation would require a form of *yogāvacara* with Middle Indic *v* > *p*, itself not so unlikely. The problem comes with finding even one instance of *yogāvacara* in a context other than later, post-canonical Pāli. No instances of the form from, for example,

¹ It is also difficult to say whether anyone would have understood this rendering. One indication of the problems this translation may have caused are seen by the attempt of Huilin to explain the term. T. 2128 (LIV) 400b3-4: 離院。鸚鵡反。考聲云。限礙也。隘也。從𠂔字從戶從乙今俗從厂從巳作厄誤也。錯已久矣。經文多從木或從手作扼字書把頭也。非此義。 It is not clear to me from this exactly how Huilin understood the compound; perhaps something like “[a monk] free of restrictions, limits, obstacles, separations”? But it is obvious enough that he did not recognize 離扼 as a set term with which he was familiar (and we are speaking here of a lexicographer of Buddhist texts).

² The following is based on personal correspondence during 1993-94 with Yamabe, who has freely shared his thoughts and references with me.

Central Asian or Kashmiri texts seem to be citable in the presently available materials. If the translation is based not on a traditional explanation but on a misunderstanding based on a Middle Indic variant form of the word, it would, moreover, as I mentioned above, suggest a complete lack of familiarity on the part of the Chinese translators with the term and concept of the *yogācāra*, which then forced those translators to come up with some sort of ad hoc solution. It is hard to say if these circumstances were present, but given the frequency with which the term *yogācāra* appears throughout Buddhist literature, as we have seen, the assumption must be that this explanation is problematic. The presentation of further evidence, such as “etymologies” for the term *yogācāra* or *yogāvacara*, might lead toward a solution of the problem.

In summing up, let us look at the opinions of several scholars. Concerning the issue of the *yogācāra*, La Vallée Poussin remarked as follows¹:

The Pāli scriptures recognize and admit, alongside of monks of strict observance, an ill-defined category of ascetics (yogins, *yogāvacaras*, later *yogācāras*), who are at the same time saints and irregulars, schismatics or heretics. They are referred to as men of the forest (*āraṇyaka*) or of cemeteries (*śāmaṇīkas*). Doing away with the novitiate and communal living, stringent in their practice of the rigorous rules of asceticism, they are professional solitaries and penitents, and thus thaumaturges.

In this regard he offered a note and commented on the passage from the *Mahāvastu* and on occurrences of the term *yogāvacara* in Pāli, remarking: “I think that in the *Mahāvastu* ... the *Yogācāras*, who are spoken of with disfavor, are not the adherents of the doctrine of the *Vijñānavāda* but rather ascetic thaumaturges.” That the first half of the statement is true now seems obvious. What it would require, however, to uphold the claim that *yogācāras* are “ascetic thaumaturges” is not clear to me, and I have not myself

¹ La Vallée Poussin 1909: 356.

noted any evidence which would point in that direction.¹

The use of the term *yogācāra* in the *Yogācārabhūmi* and other texts has been treated by Ron Davidson in the context of his study of the early Yogācāra school:² “Probably the oldest use of the term ‘Yogācāra’ ... indicates simply a ‘yogin’ and should be considered identical with that term.” Davidson goes on to refer to the usage in the curious passage from the *Mahāvastu*, then suggesting:³ “From this use we see the graduation to the usage of *yogācāra* indicating a Buddhist *yogin*, specifically a monk.” It seems therefore that Davidson thinks the meaning of the term in the *Mahāvastu* and other earlier materials is that of a non-Buddhist yogin. I think this cannot be correct in light of the many instances of the term in Vinaya texts, as we have seen, in which it clearly indicates a Buddhist meditator (and let us not forget here that the *Mahāvastu* is a Vinaya text too).⁴

Finally, Gustav Roth concludes his discussion of the term *yogācāra* as follows:

As the designation of a monk as *yogācāra* or *yogācārin* is not at home in the old Vinaya text of the Hīnayāna trend we can conclude that this term has entered our text from later strata of Buddhist tradition not belonging to the ancient Vinaya. The well confirmed occurrence of *bhikṣur yogācāra*

¹ For a discussion of Buddhist “wonder working,” see Gómez 1977.

² Davidson 1985: 126.

³ Davidson 1985: 127.

⁴ Davidson 1985: 184 says:

The other element in establishing the nature of the fundamēt and its transformation — or ‘replacement’ is the definition surrounding the four-fold purification (*pariśuddhi*) found within the **Revatasūtra* and given by Asaṅga in the *Śr[āvaṇa]Bh[ūmi]* as the canonical source for fundamēt transformation. There the question is posed concerning the manner of a *yogācāra* becoming one practicing unobstructed meditation (*anirākṛtadhyāyī*). The answer is that a *yogācāra* who practices diligently the correct meditative activity will obtain, touch and come face to face with a) the purity of fundamēt (*āśrayapariśuddhi*) from the cleansing of all hindrances (*sarvadauṣṭhulyānām pratiprasādh*), with b) the purity of objective support (*ālambanapariśuddhi*) through the inspection of the objects of knowledge (*jñeyavastupratyavekṣatayā*), with c) the purity of mind (*cittapariśuddhi*) through the elimination of desire (*rāgavirāgāt*), and with d) the purity of gnosis (*jñānapariśuddhi*) through the elimination of ignorance (*avidyāvirāgāt*).

Such a portrayal of the *yogācāra* is, of course, highly systematized and must represent a stage of development subsequent to, or at least distinct from, that represented in the *Ratnarāsi*.

in the Mahāyānist Kāśyapaparivarta as well as the traceability of *yogācāra* in Abhidh[arma]k[ōśa] indicates that it has its origin in the early strata of Mahāyāna Buddhism during the period of transition from Hīnayāna to Mahāyāna.

I am not quite sure how Roth has arrived at his conclusion concerning the origins of the term, namely that it is a Mahāyānist term evidently, as I understand him, borrowed from Mahāyāna circles by, as Roth calls them, “Hīnayāna” authors. Setting aside the problem of the Mahāyāna / Hīnayāna dichotomy, which I have made attempts to reject in some detail above, I simply wonder how Roth thinks the available evidence allows us to postulate a Mahāyāna origin for the term or concept. The abundance of references to the term in the Vinaya literature, with the exception of that of the Pāli canon, as well as the common appearance of the term in Abhidharma texts such as the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and *Mahābhāṣā* certainly does not, at least prima facie, suggest a Mahāyāna origin for the idea. It is possible that the absence of the term in the Nikāya / Āgama corpus led Roth to suspect that it did not properly belong to the orthodox Sectarian traditions. To be sure, several rather complicated problems remain, such as the origin of the term itself, the relation between the terms *yogācāra* and *yogāvacara*, the explanation of the strange Chinese translation in the *Ratnarāśi*, and the meaning of the term *yogācārabhūmi*. In addition, there remains the problem we set aside at the outset, namely the relation (if any!) between the *yogācāra bhikṣu* and the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda school. But for the present, it is I think abundantly clear that the ideal practitioner of the *Ratnarāśi* is a monk devoted to meditative cultivation.

Bad monks

At the outset I referred to the “apotheosis of the evil Buddhist,” the monk who represents everything that the good religious practitioner is not. The *Ratnarāśi* is

particularly rich in imagery portraying this “anti-ideal.” The discussion of this topic, although spread throughout the text, is concentrated most in Chapter Three on the “Outcaste Śramaṇa,” the *caṇḍāla-śramaṇa*. It will be important to discuss some of this imagery, and the ideology behind it. This, then, commences our discussion of the bad and the ugly.

Concern with broken precepts or bad behavior is one of the most common themes in many varieties of Buddhist literature. The technical term most characteristic of this discussion is *duḥśīla*. I have generally translated this term, modifying a person (usually a monk) as “precept breaker” or “of broken precepts,” in contrast to *śīlavat* which I have rendered “precept keeping” or “precept keeper.” I am aware that this is a rather strong reading of the terms, which could ordinarily be understood simply as something like “of poor / good behavior.”¹ While it is no doubt difficult to even hypothetically determine what sort of nuanced reading Buddhists of any given time and place actually gave to terms like these, there are certain methods we may use to conjecture at their understanding. One is to examine how commentaries explain words (if they do, for it is often the most crucial and, for us, difficult words which are glossed over), and another is to look at translations. While there can be little question that translation equivalents are, on the whole, determined by traditional understandings, it is possible that, at least in the case of certain Chinese translations, they may give us access to slightly older strata of the tradition than do the commentaries. It is questionable, however, whether the Chinese translations represent less self-conscious and reflective understandings than do the obviously “interpretive” commentaries. For better or for worse, in the end I think it is a fact that other than offering strictly etymological translations, which are clearly unsatisfac-

¹ For Sanskrit, MW s.v. quotes the word with the senses “badly disposed, ill-behaved.” Böhtlingk and Roth 1855-75 s.v. render “schlechte Neigungen, Gewohnheiten —, einer schlechten Charakter haben,” with Epic and Classical references.

tory, we have little choice other than to follow traditional understandings of terms, in so far as we can determine them. Whether in each and every case we can avoid anachronism must remain a sticky point, and in this regard perhaps all we can do is remain sensitive to the possibility and proceed with caution. This is the course I have tried to take.

In the present case, I believe we have a good argument for a strong reading of the term *duḥśīla*. The term *duḥśīla* is normally translated into Chinese as 破戒, but dictionaries also list the following possibilities: 毀戒, 犯戒, 犯禁, 破禁戒, 犯業, 無持戒, 毀犯淨戒, 惡戒者, 未有戒者, and so on.¹ These renderings leave no doubt that on the whole the Chinese translators, at least, understood the term *duḥśīla* not in a more generic sense of “bad behavior” but quite explicitly as referring to breaking the Buddhist precepts. The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Vyākhyā* also understand the term in this way, and even more technically, specifying in fact that it is actually the commission of a *pārājika* offence, and its non-confession, which makes one *duḥśīla*. The *Bhāṣya* reads:²

A monk does not abandon the vows of a monk even by the commission of a grave offence. Why? It is not reasonable that one abandon the complete vows because of wavering in one portion [of them]. Nor does one who commits another offence [other than a grave offence] destroy the precepts. Why? He partakes of both precept and the breaking of the precepts. Thus someone may have both wealth and debt. But when [the monk] confesses his offence he becomes a precept keeper, not a precept breaker, just as when one pays off one's debts one is a possessor of wealth, not a debtor.

¹ Wogihara 1964-74: s.v. *duḥśīla* (597a).

² Pradhan 1975: 223.7-11 (the listing 228.11 in Hirakawa et al. 1973, s.v. *duḥśīla* is a misprint for 223.11.), and Shastri 1971: 644.2-7. The text is translated in La Vallée Poussin 1923-31: iv.95-96. *na maulim apy āpattim āpannasyāsti bhikṣusaṃvaratyāgaḥ / kiṃ karaṇam / na hy ekadeśakṣobhāt kṛtsna-saṃvaratyāgo yukta iti / naiva cānyām apy āpattim āpannasyāsti śīlacchedaḥ / kiṃ tarhi / dvayam asya bhavati śīlaṃ dauḥśīlyam ca / yathā kasyacid dhanam syād ṛṇam ca / āviṣkṛtāyām tu tasyām āpattau śīlavān bhavati na duḥśīlo yathā ṛṇam śodhayitvā dhanavān bhavati na tv ṛṇavān iti /*

The *Vyākhyā* comments:¹

The Vinaya says: ‘If a precept breaking monk gives instruction to a nun he commits a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* offence.’ For, a monk who has committed a *pārājika* offence is designated a ‘precept breaker,’ and the text speaks of an opposition between one who has committed various *pārājika* offences and one who is inherently a precept keeper. From this it is understood that even one who is a precept breaker is still a monk, since it is said [in the Vinaya] ‘he commits a *saṅghāvaśeṣa* offence.’ It is reasonable to say ‘It is not reasonable that one abandon the complete vows because of wavering in one portion [of them].’ ‘Even by the commission of a grave offence’ means even for one who has committed a *patanīya* offence. ‘Nor does one who commits another offence’ means when one confesses offences such as *saṅghāvaśeṣa* offences and so on.

I do not want to suggest that this quite technical meaning was assumed by the sūtras which commonly use the term, of course, but it does seem clear that we have considerable support for a reading of the term in a sense much stronger than mere “bad behavior.” I will proceed on this basis, and note that this seems to strongly correlate with my view that the *Ratnarāśi* is concerned with proper *monastic* behavior in a very conservative, orthodox and orthopractic sense.

Much of the imagery of the *Ratnarāśi* in Chapter Three is “borrowed,” if not directly from the literature of the Sektarian canons then from some sort of common pool of such materials. In addition, there are a large number of close parallels between the set phrases, clichés or stock expressions in the *Ratnarāśi* and those in, for example, the Pāli

¹ Shastri 1971: 644.16-22. The *Vyākhyā* is summarized in La Vallée Poussin 1923-31: iv.95-96, note 5. *vinaya uktam / duḥśilāś ced bhikṣur bhikṣuṇīm auśāsti saṅghāvaśeṣam āpadyata iti / āpanna-pārājiko hi bhikṣur duḥśīlo 'bhipreto nānāpannapārājikaḥ prakṛtisthaḥ śīlavān iti viparyayeṇa vacanāt / ato 'vagamyate / asty asya duḥśilasyāpi sato bhikṣubhāvo yasmāt saṅghāvaśeṣam āpadyata ity uktam iti / yuktir api na hy ekadeśakṣobhāt sakalasamvartatyāgo yukta iti / na maulīm apy āpattim āpannasyeti / patanīyām apy āpattim āpannasyety arthaḥ / naiva cānyāpattim iti / saṅghāvaśeṣādikam āviṣṭatāyām iti / deśitāyām /*

canon. The *Aṅguttara Nikāya* contains a fine example with the following:¹

“What do you think, monks? Which is better: That a strong man might completely wrap up one’s body in hot iron sheets, burning, ablaze, all afire, or that one might enjoy a robe as a gift of faith from the house of a great kṣatriya, or from the house of a great brahman, or from the house of a great householder?”

[They answered:] “This is better, Reverend, namely that one might enjoy a robe as a gift of faith from the house of a great kṣatriya, or from the house of a great brahman, or from the house of a great householder. For this is painful, Reverend, namely that a strong man might completely wrap up one’s body in hot iron sheets, burning, ablaze, all afire.”

“I announce, monks, I proclaim, monks: Indeed it is better for that precept breaker, of evil behavior, impure, vile conduct, who acts secretly, who while not a śramaṇa falsely claims to be a śramaṇa, who while not a keeper of the practice of purity falsely claims to be a keeper of the practice of purity, who is internally putrid, internally leaking, internally of a rotten nature, that a strong man might completely wrap up his body in hot iron sheets, burning, ablaze, all afire [than that he might enjoy a robe as a gift of faith, and so on]. Why? Since on that account, monks, he might suffer death, or suffering close to that of death, but as a result of that he will never after the breaking up of the body and after death be reborn in an evil state, an evil destiny, a state of punishment, hell. But for the precept breaker ... who enjoys a robe as a gift of faith from the house of a great kṣatriya, or from the house of a great brahman, or from the house of a great householder — for him, monks, there is suffering and harm through the long night of saṃsāra, and after the breaking up of the body and after death he is reborn in an evil state, an evil destiny, a state of punishment, hell.

More generally speaking, of course, we also find a widespread and old concern with the degenerate monk in Buddhist literature. We will mention below the connection between “historicizing” views of the decline of the community and the view of the *Ratnarāsi*, but for the present it should be enough to show that such concerns over

¹ AN iv.130,29-131,22 (LXVIII.4).

decline seem to go back to almost the oldest strata of the canonical literature. In an image quite different from that quoted above, this time found in the Pāli *Vinaya*, the monastic community is compared to an ocean, and as an ocean is said to reject a dead body and force it ashore (a proverbial belief), so the community too gets rid of the “deadwood” of the impure śramaṇa. The passage reads:¹

By way of example, monks, the ocean does not dwell together with a dead corpse. A dead corpse in the ocean it quickly drives ashore, it washes up onto dry land. Just so, monks, the community does not dwell together with a person who is a precept breaker, of evil behavior, impure, vile conduct, who acts secretly, who while not a śramaṇa falsely claims to be a śramaṇa, who while not a keeper of the practice of purity falsely claims to be a keeper of the practice of purity, who is internally putrid, internally leaking, internally of a rotten nature, and quickly assembling it suspends him.² Although he may be sitting in the midst of the community of monks, still he is far away from the community and the community is far away from him.

Let us turn now more directly to the imagery of Chapter Three. The *caṇḍāla*, “outcaste” or “untouchable,” is surely one of the best known social institutions of India, and is a status which has existed from ancient times.³ The existence of the institution is assumed in Buddhist literature as well, although studies on this topic are relatively few. We do have at least two studies of the image of the *caṇḍāla* in Buddhist texts, however,

¹ Vin ii.239,3-14 (Cullavagga IX.1.4): *seyyathāpi bhikkhave mahāsamuddo na matena kuṇāpena saṁvasati yaṁ hoti mahāsamudde matarā kuṇāpaṁ taṁ khippaṁ ñeva tīraṁ vāheti thalaṁ ussāreti evaṁ eva kho bhikkhave yo so puggalo dussilo pāpadhammo asucisaṁkassarasamācāro paṭicchannakammanto assamaṇo samaṇapaṭiñño abrahmacārī brahmacāripaṭiñño antopūti avassuto kasambukajāto na tena saṁgho saṁvasati khippaṁ eva ca naṁ sannipatitvā ukkhipati kiṁ ca so hoti majjhe bhikkhusaṁghassa nisinno atha kho so ārakā 'va saṁghamhā saṁgho ca tena. yaṁ pi bhikkhave yo so puggalo dussilo ... saṁgho ca tena ayam bhikkhave imasmim dhammavinaye tatiyo ... abhiramanti. My translation is indebted to that of Horner 1952: 5.334.*

² The expression used for the community's “suspension” of the precept breaking monk, *ukkhipati*, refers to the *ukkhepanā* which has been characterized as “a sort of social boycott of the monk.” See Upasak 1975: 37, and his whole entry on *ukkhepanīyakamma* for details on the suspension. It is not an absolute ban on the monk, and it is possible that the monk be reinstated into the community after such a suspension. It is, however, a serious penalty and indicates a particularly recalcitrant offender.

³ See Yamazaki 1987: 101-53 for a detailed treatment of *caṇḍālas* and untouchability.

perhaps the more relevant one being that by Ujike Kakushō.¹ Ujike quotes, in addition to other texts, several passages from the *Ratnarāṣi*, and remarks that although other texts do contain similar discussions, Chapter Three of the *Ratnarāṣi* seems to be the only example of a consolidated treatment. Without a much broader knowledge of Buddhist literature than I possess, I would hesitate to say what does or does not exist elsewhere, but it is certainly true that the *Ratnarāṣi* has devoted quite a bit of attention to the problem of bad and degenerate monks.

At least as early as the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* we find the image of the bad practitioner compared to the outcaste. Here the comparison is not to the monk, however, but to the upāsaka. The text has:²

Endowed with five qualities, monks, an upāsaka becomes an outcaste of an upāsaka, and a stain of an upāsaka, a despised upāsaka.³ Which five? (1) He is without faith. (2) He is a precept breaker. (3) He is an omen teller at festivals. (4) He believes in omens but not in karma. (5) And he seeks those worthy of his charity outside of this [order], and offers devotion there.

When we turn to the Mahāyāna literature, we find numerous parallel examples. There are several relevant passages in the Chinese versions of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*, as for example a reference to the proud bodhisattva as “like a *caṇḍāla*,” a glossorial note explains the latter term in “the language of China.”⁴ Another *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* passage, identical with a passage in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*,⁵ discusses one who dwells

¹ Ujike 1985. See also, for the Tantric literature, Matsunaga 1991.

² AN iii.206,5-10 (CLXXV.1): *pañcahi bhikkhave dhammehi samannāgato upāsako upāsaka-caṇḍālo ca hoti upāsakamalaṇ ca upāsakapatikiṭṭho ca. katamehi pañcahi. assaddho hoti dussīlo hoti kotūhalaṃgaṇaliko pacceti no kammaṃ ito ca bahiddhā dakkhiṇeyyaṃ gavesati tattha ca pubbakāraṃ karoti*. There is no Chinese parallel. In the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* I.235, an upāsaka who is not faithful, moral and is superstitious is called a *caṇḍāla upāsaka*, etc.

³ For the last see BHSD s.v. *pratikṛṣṭa* and *pratikṛṣṭa*.

⁴ T. 221 放光般若經 (VIII) 97a25-26.

⁵ T. 223 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 (VIII) 353b26-c1, identical with *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (Wogihara 1932-35: 782-83 = Mitra 393-95) = T. 224 道行般若經 (VIII) 461c2-8 = T. 225 大明度經 (VIII) 499a25-29 = T. 226 摩訶般若鈔經 (VIII) 534c3-8 = T. 227 小本般若波羅蜜經 (VIII) 571b3-7 = T. 228 佛母出生三法藏

in the forest without the proper attitude, giving confused advice to other bodhisattvas. The bad bodhisattva is then characterized in the following terms, with other imagery we will encounter again below:

Subhūti. You should know this one as the bodhisattva-caṇḍāla. You should know him as a polluter of bodhisattvas. You should know him as an imitation bodhisattva. You should know him as a counterfeit bodhisattva. You should know him as a chaff bodhisattva. He is a thief wearing the clothing of a śramaṇa. He is a thief of people belonging to the vehicle of the bodhisattvas. He is a thief of the world along with its gods. Such people as these should not be approached, should not be worshipped and should not be honored.

The commentary of Haribhadra on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* informs us that “he is a bodhisattva-caṇḍāla since he is not to be approached by other bodhisattvas.”¹

The *Sūryagarbhasūtra* has an interesting discussion of the precept-breaking monk. Although the provenance of this text is complicated and still on the whole unclear, to be on the safe side we should assume that it does not represent strictly Indian ideas. I render a passage from the text here from one of its Chinese versions, but below I will also translate a longer passage from Tibetan which, presumably, corresponds to this. The differences, however, are striking, and should put us on our guard with regard to both sources. This said, the fact remains that the comparison with the *Ratnarāśi* is illuminating:²

The king said to the Blessed One: “May precept-breaking monks accept the gift of faith?”

[The Blessed One said:] “Great King. As long as a kingdom has one

般若波羅蜜多經 (VIII) 653c3-8). The Sanskrit, from which I translate, reads: *ayam Subhūte bodhisattva-caṇḍālo veditavyo bodhisattvadūṣī veditavyo bodhisattvapratirūpako veditavyo bodhisattvaprativarnīko veditavyo bodhisattvakāraṇḍavako veditavyaś cauraḥ śramaṇaveśaṇa cauro bodhisattvayānikānām pudgalānām cauraḥ sadevakasya lokasya tajiātītaḥ khalu punaḥ Subhūte pudgalo na sevītavyo na bhaktavyo na paryupāsītavyaḥ.*

¹ Wogihara 1932-35: 783.14: *anyair bodhisattvair asprīsyatvād bodhisattvacāṇḍālaḥ.*

² T. 397 (XIII) 215c2-27.

criminal not yet driven out, even if the king were to make presents to the kṣatriyas, brāhmaṇas, vaiśyas and śūdras, would people tend to be happy or not?”

“They would not, Blessed One.”

“Great King. The precept breaking monk is also like this. Although he is in the community and accepts gifts of faith he does not obtain happiness. Why? Because he breaks the precepts, and because he does not conform to the teachings. Great King. Such a person as this is not embraced protectively (**pari-grah*) by all the infinite buddhas of the ten directions. Although he is called a monk he is not counted among the monastic community. Why? Because he has entered the world of Māra. Upholders of the precepts are disciples of the Buddha. Destroyers of the precepts are disciples of Māra. Again, upholding the precepts is the supramundane path (**lokottarmārga*), violating the precepts is the mundane path (**laukikamārga*). I do not allow people who violate the precepts to accept gifts of faith even so little as a sesame seed (**taila*?) from people. Why? Because these people are distantly removed from the teaching of the Tathāgata.”

The king spoke to the Blessed One: “What are the characteristic signs of precept-breakers? Can one recognize them?”

“Great King, there are wise people who are able to recognize them. If there are those with an inability to venerate the three jewels, who fail to have faith and have no sense of modesty and shame, have no respect for teachers, precepts, elders, venerables, fellow teachers and fellow students, who shatter the banner of the nobles and do not live the life of purity (**brahmacaryā*), who increase their cravings and delight in the lay life, who cannot purify the four types of verbal action,¹ who always are concerned about food and whose minds are far from the teachings, who delight in worldly, profitless talk, this is called the first characteristic sign of the violation of precepts. But this is not yet called full violation of the precepts. If one were to accept beasts, male and female slaves, elephants, horses, cattle, sheep, camels, mules, chickens, wild boars on up to any of the eight types of impure things,²

¹ Abusive language, lying, criticizing and exaggeration.

² There are different explanations of the eight. See Oda 1917: 1415a.

this is called complete violation of the precepts. Such [people] are called the dregs among the śramaṇas, the crooked among the śramaṇas, the deceitful among the śramaṇas, the thieves among the śramaṇas, the intoxicated among the śramaṇas, the caṇḍāla among the śramaṇas. You should not dwell together with such monks, nor associate together with them on friendly terms. You should not carry out the ninety-nine ecclesiastical actions (**karma*) together with them.¹ These are called “lost monks,” and their behavior leads them to fall into lust.² Great King. As it is better to stop associating with caṇḍālas, so one should not dwell together with such evil monks. Why? Such monks burn up their roots of good, and cut off the good mind of compassion in the three worlds.”

Other examples of bad bodhisattvas compared to a *caṇḍāla* include the **Upāsaka-sīla-sūtra*, 優婆塞戒經: A bodhisattva who attracts beings not in accord with the four *saṃgrahavastu* or “articles of attraction,” giving, kind speech, inspiring others to profitable action and sympathy for others, is called an evil man, a bodhisattva in name only, not a bodhisattva in the true meaning of the term, a *caṇḍāla* unclean and impure, a destroyer of the Buddha’s teaching.³

There are, however, also positive portrayals of caṇḍālas in Buddhist literature. In an interesting passage in the *Anguttara Nikāya*, Sāriputta compares himself to a caṇḍāla: “Just as, Reverend, a little caṇḍāla boy or a little caṇḍāla girl, with basket in hand, clad in rags, entering village or town enters developing a humble attitude, just so, Reverend, I dwell with a disposition the same as the little caṇḍāla boy”⁴ The same sort of positive approach is found in a Mahāyāna text as well. The *Ratnamegha* says that one of the ways one may become a noble (**ājaneya*) is “practicing in the world like the poor

¹ I have not been able to find such a category, called here 九十九羯磨, mentioned in the reference sources available to me.

² ? 貪處.

³ T. 1488 (XXIV) 1046a24-26. The passage is translated in Shih 1991: 58; see also Ujike 1985: 5.

⁴ AN iv.376,11-15 (XI.4). The same is found in the *Ekottarāgama* T. 125 (II) 713a24.

child of a caṇḍāla.”¹

In a recent and very interesting paper, Shimoda Masahiro has put forward the suggestion that there was a shift over time in the attitude toward *caṇḍālas* of the *dharma-bhāṇakas* who preached the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, the earlier period being one of acceptance which later gave way to intolerance.² If this hypothesis were correct it would necessitate a close reexamination of all our other materials concerning this question, since it would imply that we can offer suppositions concerning chronology, or at least relative chronologies, on this basis. Unfortunately, I find that I cannot agree with Shimoda’s hypothesis which is, I believe, based on a rather strong over-reading of his materials. As far as I can tell, he has based his argument concerning the early tolerance of *caṇḍālas* on one passage in one of the Chinese translations of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, in which it is stated that in times of internal disorder in a land the dharma-preacher may take recourse to the protection offered by *caṇḍālas* and those carrying weapons, and may travel in dangerous areas in their company. Other, according to Shimoda later, versions of the same text contradict this “liberal view.” I do not want to enter into a detailed critique of Shimoda’s theory here, but it may suffice for the present to note that there are numerous exceptional rules in various Buddhist texts allowing otherwise impermissible activities in times of strife and hardship, and I cannot see that the passage so emphasized by Shimoda should be treated any differently.³ This is in a sense unfortunate, since it would have been nice to discover such a vital clue to early

¹ T. 659 (XVI) 257a10: 行於世間如旃陀羅卑下之子。This is differently interpreted by different versions. T. 459 (XIV) 726c15-16 has “to despise oneself and hate one’s body as a caṇḍāla,” 能於世間自卑其身如旃陀羅謙下其意, and T. 660 (XVI) 305c6-7: 隨順諸法平等理趣通達實相遊止世間心常下劣如旃茶羅。

² Shimoda 1991. For a brief introduction to some of Shimoda’s key ideas in English, see Shimoda 1994.

³ This general tendency is in fact also common in other Indian normative texts under the name *āpaddharma*, or “rules for adverse circumstances.”

Mahāyāna ideology. Perhaps Shimoda, who is now preparing his doctoral thesis for publication, will be able to more convincingly substantiate his hypothesis in the future.

Let us look now at another image in the same chapter of the *Ratnarāṣi*, that of the thief-monk. The Pāli Vinaya discusses the definition of one who, without being ordained, pretends to be a monk for the sole purpose of supporting himself materially.¹ The account concerns a pampered aristocratic youth who knows himself unable of working for a living. He considers by what means he may live in comfort, and imagines:

These śramaṇas, Śākyapūtriyas, are of a pleasant character and pleasant conduct; enjoying good food they lie down to sleep in safe beds. Why don't I prepare a bowl and robes, remove my hair and beard, put on the ochre robes, and go to the forest and dwell together with the monks?

The young man does so, but is subsequently questioned by the monks concerning his seniority and his preceptor. Eventually the matter is reported to the Buddha who rules: "One who is a community member by theft, monks, if unordained must not be ordained, if ordained must be banished." While there seems to be some confusion here, since the very definition of the rule implies the fact that the imitator is not ordained, the meaning, or one meaning, is nevertheless clear: to steal the outward signs of the monk as a means of obtaining a livelihood is an offense which requires banishment.²

In another Vinaya discussion, we find the comparison to five types of "great thieves."³ The first example compares an evil monk (*pāpabhikkhu*) to a thief, since the monk thinks: "To be sure, I, surrounded by a retinue of a hundred or a thousand, will

¹ Vin i.86,10-35 (Mahāvagga I.62).

² I do not know if the reference is to the technical category of *nāsanā*, "revocation of the privileges of a sāmaṇera or a bhikkhunī (not of a bhikkhu) on account of his or her misbehavior," as Upasak 1975: 119 explains. The Vinaya text explicitly refers to the possibility that the offender may be ordained with the higher ordination, saying: *upasampanno nāsetabbo*. This would certainly imply that monks are considered liable to banishment.

³ Vin iii.89,24-90,22 (Suttavibhaṅga, Pārājika IV.1.3). See also *Samantapāsādikā* ii.482ff. The Chinese is found in T. 1462 (XXIV) 755a3ff. The latter is translated in Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 336ff.

wander around in villages, towns and metropolises,¹ honored, respected, revered, worshipped, esteemed, and receiving the requisites of robes, alms, bedding, and medicine from householders and renunciants alike.” Such a monk is called a “great thief (*mahā-cora*).” The fourth type of great thief is the evil monk who encourages and persuades² a householder [probably: to accept from the community] inalienable goods and requisites, namely wilderness retreats, wilderness retreat areas, monasteries, monastery areas, and so on.³ The final item seems to differ in the Vinaya and its commentary, the *Samantapāsādikā*. In the former the fifth category is one who claims for himself a spiritual state he has not attained, while the commentary has simply theft of items belonging to the community.

This same image is also found in another sūtra in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* which, thematically at least, is quite similar to the *Ratnarāśi*, the *Maitreyamahāsimhanāda-sūtra*.⁴

“Kāśyapa. Now, what is the thief-śramaṇa? There are four types of

¹ Horner’s “... possessions of kings” (Horner 1938: 1.154) for *°rājadhānīsu* must be considered nearly incomprehensible. The word is quite ordinary in Pāli and Sanskrit and certainly does not require to be treated in such an obscurantist way.

² I believe, contra CPD s.v. *upalāpeti*, that the verb here belongs with their definition 2 “to persuade, lure, entice, deceive, corrupt etc.” rather than definition 1 “to talk in a friendly way to, address, greet.”

³ See Horner 1938: 1.156 for the list. I translate *garubhaṇḍa* and *garuparikkhāra* with the term “inalienable” following the definition at Vin ii.170,4ff. that the items listed may not be alienated by the community, as Horner points out 1.156, note 2. The Pāli Vinaya text is not clear, but the *Samantapāsādikā* (ii. 484) clarifies that the act of the monk giving away monastic property is what makes him a thief.

⁴ The text is found in Chinese at T. 310 [XI] 502a18-24, and in Tibetan at P 61b5-62a1 = M 126b3-8 = S 153a1-6: ‘od srung [S srungs, and so below] de la dge sbyong gi chom rkun [P rkum] gang zhe na / bzhi po ‘di dag ni dge sbyong gi chom rkun yin te / [P //] bzhi gang zhe na / ‘od srung ‘di la [P adds dge slong] dge sbyong gi kha dog dang / rtags dang / dbyibs la gnas shing [S /] de yang [S de’ang] tshul khrims ‘chal pa dang / [S / ø] sdig pa ‘i chos can yin par gyur na / de ni dge sbyong gi chom rkun dang po yin no // dben pa ‘i gnas su song ste [P /] gnas pa na / [P / ø] mi dge ba ‘i rnam par rtog pa dag la rnam par rtog par byed na // [M // ø; S /] de ni dge sbyong gi chom rkun gnyis pa yin no // bdag nyid ‘bras bu ma thob cing so so ‘i skye bo yin par shes bzhi du [P /] rnyed pa dang / [P / ø] bkur sti dang / [M / ø] tshigs su bcad pa ‘dod pas [P /] zil kyis non pas / [M / ø] gzhan dag gi mdun du bdag nyid dgra bcom pa yin par khas ‘che bar byed na / [P //] de ni dge sbyong gi chom rkun gsum pa yin no // bdag la bstod [P stod] cing gzhan la smod par byed na / [M / ø] de ni [P na] dge sbyong gi chom rkun bzhi ba yin te / ‘od srung bzhi po de dag ni dge sbyong gi chom rkun yin no //. My translation is from the Tibetan.

thief-śramaṇa. Which are the four? Kāśyapa. In this regard: (1) when the monk has the figure, distinguishing marks and appearance of a śramaṇa but still violates the precepts and is of an evil character, he is the first thief-śramaṇa. (2) If one goes to a secluded spot, and dwells there, but his mental activity is imagination directed toward the non-good (**akuśala-vikalpa*), he is the second thief-śramaṇa. (3) If one is a common person who has not attained the fruit (**aphalaprāptapṛthagjana*), but is interested in profit, reverence and fame (**lābhasatkāraśloka*), overcome (**abhibhūta?*), who claims to others that he is an Arhat, he is the third thief-śramaṇa. (4) If one praises himself and disparages others, he is the fourth thief-śramaṇa. Those four, Kāśyapa, are the thief-śramaṇas.

We should not imagine that these sorts of images are the exclusive property of the Buddhists, however. The Jaina *Dasaveyāliya-sutta* contains the following:¹

A man who, [in the manner of] a thief (*stena*), claims the fasting (*tapas*), preaching (*vāc*), outward habit (*rūpa*), conduct (*ācāra*) [and] mind (*bhāva*) [of a pious monk to be as his], works a future existence as a servant god (*devakilbiṣa*). And when he is to be born as a god and comes to existence as a servant god, he does not know which of his deeds results in this. When his life there has come to an end, he will be born with impediment in his speech, then in one of the hells or as an animal, where it is very difficult to attain enlightenment.

Other comparisons of bad śramaṇas in Chapter Three include a series of agricultural metaphors. However, while the agricultural imagery of the *Ratnarāśi* is very striking, not all of it is, after all, unique. It seems, in fact, that in some instances the sūtra may well be repeating canonical stereotypes. We find in the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* the following:²

¹ *Dasaveyāliyasutta* 5.2.46-48, with text and a translation in Leumann and Schubring 1932: 33 and 96-97. The text reads: *tavatene vaitene rūvatene ya je nare / āyārabhāvatene ya kuvvā devakibbisam // laddhūna vi devattam uvavanno devakibbise / tatthāvi se na yānāi kiṃ me kiccā imam phalaṃ // tatto vi se caittānam labbhīhi elamūyagam / narayam tirikkhajonim vā bohī jattha sudullahā //*

² AN iv.169,12-170,12 (VIII.10) (my translation, but indebted to that in *Gradual Sayings*, Woodward 1932-36: IV.115): *seyyathā pi bhakkhave sampanne yavakarāṇe yavadūsī yāyetha yavapālāpo* (or:

As an example, monks, when barley (*yava*) is being cultivated, the corrupter of the barley, the chaff of the barley, the rubbish of the barley may [also] be produced. It has a root just the same as that of the other, high quality barley. It has a stalk just the same as that of the other, high quality barley. It has leaves just the same as that of the other, high quality barley — so long as its uppermost portion does not come forth. But when its uppermost portion comes forth, they know it to be thus: this is precisely the corrupter of the barley (*yava-dūṣī*), the chaff of the barley (*-palāpa* / *-palāsa*), the rubbish of the barley (*-kāraṇḍava*). And having recognized this, tearing it out roots and all they fling it away outside the barley field. Why? [Because they think:] It must not corrupt the other high quality barley! Just so, monks, the advancing, the retreating, the looking forwards, the looking around, the retraction of the limbs, the extension of the limbs, the possessing of the upper robe, bowl and robes of a certain person is just exactly like that of high quality monks — so long as the monks do not see his sin. But when the monks do see his sin, they know him to be thus: he is precisely the corrupter of the śramaṇas, the chaff of the śramaṇas, the rubbish of the śramaṇas. And recognizing him to be so they drive him away. Why? [Because they think:] He must not corrupt the other high quality monks!

°palāso) yavakāraṇḍavo tassa tādisaṃ yeva mūlaṃ hoti seyyathā pi aññesaṃ bhaddakānaṃ yavānaṃ. tādisaṃ yeva nālaṃ hoti seyyathā pi aññesaṃ bhaddakānaṃ yavānaṃ tādisaṃ yeva pattāṃ hoti seyyathā pi aññesaṃ bhaddakānaṃ yavānaṃ yāva 'ssa sīsaṃ na nibbattati yato ca khvāssa sīsaṃ nibbattati taṃ enaṃ evaṃ jānati yavadūṣī 'vāyaṃ yavapalāpo (or: °palāso) yavakāraṇḍavo ti. taṃ enaṃ iti viditvā samūlaṃ uppāṭetvā bahiddhā yavakaraṇassa chaḍḍenti. taṃ kissa hetu. mā aññe bhaddake yave dūsesi ti. evaṃ eva kho bhikkhave idh' ekaccassa puggalassa tādisaṃ yeva hoti abhikkantaṃ paṭikkantaṃ ālokitāṃ vilokitaṃ sammiñjitaṃ pasāritaṃ saṅghātipattacivaradhāraṇaṃ seyyathā pi aññesaṃ bhaddakānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ yāva 'ssa bhikkhū āpattiṃ na passanti yato ca khvāssa bhikkhū āpattiṃ passanti taṃ enaṃ evaṃ jānati samaṇadūṣī 'vāyaṃ samaṇapalāpo (or: °palāso) samaṇakāraṇḍavo ti. taṃ enaṃ iti viditvā bahiddhā nāsesi. taṃ kissa hetu. mā aññe bhaddake bhikkhū dūsesi ti.

The same passage is found in the *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 (122) (I) 611b9-20. It also appears in the last *juan* of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* T. 1428 (XXIII) 1009c4-11, and the passage parallel to *Ratnarāṣi* III.13 at c11-16. I have quoted these passages in the Chinese edition of the *Ratnarāṣi*. It is very difficult to match up the terminology in Pāli and Chinese, but we do have *samaṇadūṣī* = 沙門汚. For *samaṇapalāpa* / *samaṇapalāsa* and *samaṇakāraṇḍava* it is hard to associate 沙門辱, 沙門憎, and 沙門刺.

The term *palāpa* / *palāsa* has been discussed by K.R. Norman 1969, note to Thag 1237, and 1992, note to Sn 89. He quotes ThagA ad 1237: *palāpo ti tuccho antosārarahito sīlarahito ti attho*, “empty, without an inner core, meaning without the precepts.” Norman also quotes the commentary to AN (iv.74) as *samaṇapalāpo ti vihisu vihipalāpo viya nissāratāya samaṇesu samaṇapalāpo*, “like corrupted rice among the rice, because he is without a core he is a corrupted samaṇa among the samaṇas.” Norman rejects the reading *palāsa*.

In very much the same vein, the Commentary on the *Suttanipāta*, *Paramatthajotikā* III, has the following:¹

[A samaṇa is called] chaff because of his resemblance to chaff. As an example, chaff is so called because although on the inside it is [actually] without a rice grain, on the outside it looks like rice because of its husk. Just so, in this case someone although on the inside he is without the essence of good qualities such as the precepts and the rest looks like a samaṇa on the outside because of veiling himself in virtuous behavior and clothing himself as a samaṇa. In this way one is called 'chaff' because of his resemblance to chaff.

We find the same imagery again in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, which quotes a verse:² "You [all] must destroy the corrupt [barley], get rid of the rotten wood, drive away the seedless grain which is one who though not a monk refers to himself as a monk." Regarding this, Yaśomitra comments:³

'You [all] must destroy the corrupt [barley],' means rubbish in the form of barley, barley which resembles grass, which is to say corrupted barley. Thus he is a non-monk in the form of a monk. 'Rotten wood' means rotten wood. Thus he is a rotten monk. The Blessed One stipulated to the monks 'You must expel him from the precept keeping community.' 'You must drive away the seedless grain' refers to rice without an internal grain, found among the rice seeds. In this way you must expel that one who has the form of a monk but lacks the pith which is the precepts. It means you must drive him away. This is what is being illustrated here.

¹ Commenting on *Suttanipāta* 89, *Paramatthajotikā* iii.165,12-16: *pālapasadisattā palāpo. yathā hi palāpo anto taṇḍularahito pi bahi thusena vihi viya dissati evam idh' ekacco anto silādiguṇasāravira-hitto pi bahi subbattacchadanena samaṇavesena samaṇo samaṇo viya dissati so evam palāpasadisattā palāpo ti vuccati*. I learned of this passage from the note in Norman 1992 to *Suttanipāta* 89.

² AKB ad AK IV.39 (Pradhan 1975: 224,3-4; also quoted in the *Vyākhyā*, Shastri 1971: 2.645,12-13): *nāsayata kāraṇḍavakaṃ kaśaṇvakam apakarṣata / athotplāvinam vāhayata abhikṣum bhikṣuvādinam //*.

³ Shastri 1971: 2.645,26-646,12: *nāsayata kāraṇḍavakam iti kāraṇḍavako yavākṛtīvāt yavas tṛṇaviśeṣo yo yavadūṣity ucyate / evam asāv abhikṣur bhikṣvākṛtir iti / kaśaṇvakam nāma pūtikāṣṭham / evam asau pūtibhūto bhikṣuḥ / tam śīlavatsaṅghād yūyam apakarṣateti bhagavān bhikṣūn ājñāpayāmāsa / athotplāvinam vāhayateti utplāvi nāma vrīhimadhye 'bhyanatarataṇḍulahīno vrīhir eva / tathāsau śīlasārahīno bhikṣvākṛtiḥ tam pravāhayata / niṣkrāmayatety arthaḥ / idam atrodāharaṇam /*.

What we have seen here is that this example of the imagery of precept breaking, degenerate monks is not only not unique to the *Ratnarāśi*, but in some cases virtually a repetition of what is found in the canonical Nikāya / Āgama corpus. By extension, this would tend to suggest that there was a common concern with the degeneration of monks among the authors of these texts. And yet, the term “degeneration” should probably be avoided, since of course one of the points I am trying to make is that concern with the “imperfect” does not necessarily represent any “degeneration” over time from a past, golden age in which everything was perfect. Rather, from one point of view things were bad, or potentially bad, from the beginning.

In two other Mahāyāna sūtras we find quite lengthy passages very similar in some ways to the *Ratnarāśi*. The *Buddhapiṭakaduḥśīlanigrahī*, a text which has much in common with the *Ratnarāśi* in terms of its concern with corruption, contains the following:¹

Again, Śāriputra, the precept breaking monk will nourish his body with provisions amassed by others. Śāriputra, I call such a monk a “load bearer.”² Why? Śāriputra, I permit the gift of faith to those who are intent (*yukta*) and those who are liberated (*mukta*). Śāriputra, again, the precept breaking monk, precisely because he is without intent application, is not liberated.

Therefore, Śāriputra, even if the precept breaking monk shreds the flesh of every bodily limb large and small for hundreds of thousands of aeons, there is no basis which will repair it again. There is no basis for repairing it through bearing loads as an ox or ass born among the realm of animals. Why? Because, Śāriputra, if precept breaking monks cannot purify even a gift of faith as small as that cleaved into a hundred thousand billionth portion, it goes without saying that there is no basis for [purifying gifts of] robes and

¹ See the end of this chapter for the text to this passage.

² Perhaps **bhārahāra* alludes to the well-known canonical discussion of the *pudgala*. See La Vallée Poussin AKB ix.256, note 1, and SN iii.25 (XXII §22).

alms.

I do not permit, Śāriputra, the precept breaking monk, [even] garbed in the banner of the sage,¹ to stride even one pace into the grounds of a monastery, not to mention [allowing him to accept] a water pot or seat or couch [i.e., the requisites of a monk]. Why? Because, Śāriputra, those dishonorable men are thieves of the world together with its gods. Śāriputra, it is proper that the world together with its gods should expel² those dishonorable men. Those dishonorable men, Śāriputra, are the enemies of the world together with its gods, they are evil companions. Śāriputra, I should provide the opportunity to preach the teaching to the world together with its gods. I drive out with a wave of the hand, Śāriputra, precept breaking monks of defiled precepts, defiled practice, defiled livelihood, defiled view. I did not provide an opportunity for them even to see me, not to mention for them to enter this instruction even for a single night or day, or even for a mere moment.

By way of example, Śāriputra: impure, putrid, stinking corpses of snakes, corpses of dogs, or human corpses are not fitting for the retinue of gods, are not fitting as objects one would wish to play with. If one were to see them he should avoid them at a great distance. In the same way, Śāriputra, wise people should know that precept breaking monks are also like a snake corpse, and just so they should be widely avoided. One should not perform any auspicious ecclesiastical acts or *uposatha* or *pravāraṇa* together with them

Why? Because those fools will be harmed for a long time, they will not be benefited, they will not be happy, they will suffer, they will be defiled, they will be overcome by others, they will be truly and completely destroyed. They will not honor those who are precept keeping monks, they though not śramaṇas will falsely claim they are śramaṇas, though not followers of the conduct of purity will falsely claim they are followers of the conduct of purity, they will tear apart the procedures and ecclesiastical acts, the *uposatha* and *pravāraṇa*.

Śāriputra, when those who are honorable, precept keeping monks see

¹

Perhaps **r̥ṣidhvaja*, but anyway, the reference is to the monastic robe.

²

**pravāsayati*.

precept breaking monks in my instruction, they will avoid them at a great distance. Why? Because, Śāriputra, you should know that mixing those bowls and robes of precept breaking monks with those of precept keeping monks is like mixing with poison. Śāriputra, I am willing to dwell in any mode of the four modes of deportment at a place full of the corpses of snakes, or full of the corpses of dogs, or full of the corpses of humans, but Śāriputra, I am not willing to dwell together with precept breaking monks of defiled conduct, of defiled livelihood, of defiled view, for even one night, one day, one moment or even one finger snap's instant. Why? Because, Śāriputra, such monks as that I call "vile monks," "sordid śramaṇas," "vulgar śramaṇas," "refuse śramaṇas," "rotten śramaṇas," "stinking śramaṇas," "weed śramaṇas," "defiled śramaṇas," "caṇḍāla śramaṇas," "impaired śramaṇas," "evil śramaṇas," "chaff śramaṇas," "outsiders to the Noble Path," "crane śramaṇas," "corrupting śramaṇas," and if they renounce the world in my instruction they will acquire a great mass of sin (*apunya*). Śāriputra, they are disputants¹ in the instruction of the Tathāgata. Śāriputra, they are thieves in the instruction of the Tathāgata, they are corrupters of the teaching. Śāriputra, those dishonorable men are deceitful, are most interested in their own livelihood, are enslaved by worldly material possessions, are most concerned with food and clothing.

By way of example, Śāriputra: it is said that a hermaphrodite is neither woman nor man. In the same way, Śāriputra, it is said that a precept breaking monk is neither householder nor śramaṇa. The designation for the object to which that conventional appellation applies is none other than "hell being."

By way of example, Śāriputra: when a bat wants to catch a bird, it enters a cave and acts like a mouse.² When it wants to catch a mouse, it joins the ranks of the birds. But it does not have the capacity for action and motion [of a bird], it does not send forth a great call and cry ...,³ and therefore it keeps to dark pits and even by nature it has a disagreeable odor. In just

¹ **kalahakāraka*? Mhy. 9305.

² This passage is quoted in the 法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 948b.

³ I do not understand, and therefore cannot translate, the expression *kha dog bzang po dang / ngan pa'i gnas rnams bstan du med de /*.

this way, Śāriputra, the precept breaking monk too will not be capable of activity and motion, and though among royal servants he is grouped with the śramaṇas, among good servants he is grouped with the householders, and therefore one should proclaim that he is neither householder nor śramaṇa. Like a corpse or a circle of light made by a twirled firebrand, his [capability for] action and movement are destroyed and thus he does not have the scent of the precepts (*śīla*), he does not have the scent of concentration (*samādhi*), he does not have the scent of wisdom (*prajñā*), he does not have the scent of liberation (*vimukti*), and he does not have the scent of wisdom and vision of liberation (*vimuktijñānadarśana*), but rather he has only the odor of broken precepts.

He cannot speak such discussions and talk appropriate to a śramaṇa, that is, talk about precepts, talk about concentration, talk about wisdom, talk about liberation, talk about wisdom and vision of liberation, and talk about acquisition of the fruit, but rather the precept breaking monk is only pleased by the joy of garrulous association with others. He is not intent, and together with those who pretend to be applying themselves he goes on for more than a day and night with much impure talk such as talk about putting on robes, talk about how “after I got food I ate it,” talk about how “when one gives a gift one should get a gift,” talk about sending messengers and letters, talk about giving leaves, flowers and fruits, talk about jokes and games and dramatic performances,¹ talk of the difficulty of controlling oneself, of the difficulty of satisfying oneself fully, of the difficulty of nourishing oneself, and such impure talk. Thus their bodily actions are impure, their vocal actions are impure, their mental actions are impure, their bodies are ruined by impure feelings and so after death falling to evil fates and evil destinies they will fall into hells.

By way of example, Śāriputra: it is said that a bat is at home in the darkness. Those foolish people too, hearing such admonishments spoken by the Tathāgata in true sūtras will experience suffering. Why? Because, Śāriputra, the whole world being angry at the truth will not believe in the preachers of the teaching. They will expand their evil fates and guarantee

¹

kun tu 'brel pa = **prayoga*? I am not confident about my rendering.

them.

This, Śāriputra, is the fifth fault of the precept breaking monk, and they will enter it evil destinies because they have guaranteed them.

Above I quoted a passage from one Chinese translation of the *Sūryagarbhasūtra*.

Here is a slightly longer section, including the section corresponding to that previous passage, this time translated from Tibetan:¹

The Blessed One said: “Great King. The precept breaker of evil behavior is like a rotten tree; though not a monk he claims to be a monk, though not a practitioner of the practice of purity he claims to be a practitioner of the practice of purity,² and such a person damages all the buddhas, the Blessed Ones, in the past, the future, and the present. He is not an auditor of the Blessed One, but rather he is attached to the tribe of Māra. That person dwells in the path of dread, and what is more he is not counted among the [members of the] community of auditors. Thus he is not to be admitted into there, and when it is intended for monks residing in accord with the Teaching, he is not able to share even a scrap of stem of the sesame, not to mention what is to be shared within the community. He is rejected by this dharma-vinaya.”

King Bimbisāra said: “Venerable Blessed One. According to what marks and signs does one know the precept breaking monk of evil behavior who is not permitted to hereafter reside among monks who reside in accord with the Teaching or to share in the goods [of the community]?”

The Blessed One said: “Great king. No one saying ‘By such characteristics as these the precept breaking monk first appears’ is able to recognize him quickly. Great king. First of all among [those signs] he does not honor the Buddha. He does not honor the Teaching, the community, the preceptors, the teachers, the guru, and so on. He has abandoned the [four] saintly attitudes, he does not delight in mental cultivation of yogic praxis, he has no use for modesty and shame, he is close to home-dwellers, he engages in worthless talk, he praises himself, he criticizes others, he takes pleasure in

¹ Derge (Tōh. 257): *mdo sde, za*, 103b5-106b7.

² The expression is a stock phrase, quoted for example in Sanskrit in Śikṣ 67.19-20: (*yo mahābrahman mamoddīśya pravrajito duḥśīlapāpasamācāro bhikṣur anubhūtaḥ kaśambakajāto aśramaṇaḥ śramaṇapratijñāḥ abrahmacārī brahmacāripratijñāḥ* /).

such things as that, he is caught in the snare of evil, he has entered wrong paths, he is haughty, impudent, a quick talker (?), insulting, he is crafty, deceitful, a crooked śramaṇa, a dishonest śramaṇa, like a lazy monk, speaks what is not agreeable to the community of monks, delights in profit, reverence and fame, delights in garrulous association with others, — and no one can quickly recognize that evil precept breaking monk by those characteristics, so long as his precept breaking does not first appear. But when that evil monk takes hold of a personal property horses, fields, monasteries, male slaves, female slaves, elephants, horses, camels, asses and sheep, his precept breaking first appears, and through that first precept breaking that evil monk is cast out of the monastic community; he may not dwell within it; he may not share its property, he is fallen from the state of a monk, driven out of the community and he will not be restored to his monkhood again.

“Great king. To be a dweller in the dwelling place of outcastes is easier than living with one in suite with an outcaste monk, who has an angry character, who does not see the significance [of the teaching], who has rejected the other world, who is without compassionate intention, who resembles a giant pit of excrement, who has entered the path of Māra, who does injury to gods and men, who deceives all the sages of the three times, who extinguishes the dharma lamp of the descendants of the three jewels, who dries up the ocean of the teaching, who causes dissension among the preachers of the teaching, who cheats donors and benefactors, who mocks monks who live according to the teaching, who interrupts the flow of a saṅgha which in agreement. That evil monk through the condition of his attachment turns people, O king, away from the path to heaven. He turns away kṣatriyas, brāhmaṇas, vaiśyas, śūdras, men, women, boys and girls. He sends them to the three paths of the bad destinies.

“Great king. Look at how much unhappiness that evil monk causes for gods and men because of his attachment. Great king. Therefore, a monk with attachments should not live together with monks who live according to the teaching, who are rich in merits, in a wilderness retreat or a monastery. If the evil monk, noisy and having no use for modesty and shame, lives together with those monks, for that reason those monks who live according to the teaching should be compassionate and be mindful in accord with the teach-

ings. If they see that that evil monk goes out from that dwelling, then it is good. If he does not go out, those monks who dwell in accord with the teaching should leave and inform whichever kṣatriyas, brāhmaṇas, vaiśyas, or śūdras who are in charge in those villages, towns, cities, metropolises, mountains or mountain hamlets. If those kṣatriyas, brāhmaṇas, vaiśyas, and śūdras drive out the evil monk full of attachments from that dwelling, those monks who dwell according to the teachings should dwell there. In case the kṣatriyas, brāhmaṇas, vaiśyas, and śūdras side with the evil monk full of attachments, for the sake of food, drink and possessions, for this reason those monks who dwell in accord with the teaching must not display anger. They should be unattached, without pride, and moreover go from that dwelling in silence. They should dwell with correct mental concentration (**yonisāmanasikāra*) in a wilderness dwelling, a jungle thicket, a mountain, a mountain village or another place, quiet and suitable for private meditation (**pratisaṃlayanasārūpya*)."

Again, King Bimbisāra, shedding tears, spoke: "Venerable, Blessed One, since for the sake of food, drink and possessions they side with the evil monk who is concerned with attachments, even monks who dwell in accord with the teaching and are rich in merits will go from their dwelling, and this will injure kṣatriyas, brāhmaṇas, vaiśyas, and śūdras. Venerable, it (even) injures the best Sugata. His attainment of the state of being human is difficult to attain. Coursing around in saṃsāra, his attainment of the state of being human is his last. Though incalculable, unlimited buddhas, blessed ones, possessed of great compassion as many as the sands on the banks of the Ganges river may appear in the world, the being who does not listen with respect to the words of the monks living in accord with the teaching will not be liberated from the evil destinies or attain to heaven, but he will come to possess such evil karma."

The Blessed One said: "Great King. In a future time there will appear a few kṣatriyas, brāhmaṇas, vaiśyas, and śūdras who have faith in monks who dwell in accord with the teachings, and for their sake they will construct wilderness hermitages. They will donate to those monasteries and wilderness dwellings items ranging from household goods through field goods, male and female slaves and workers, for their enjoyment and use. Even when they die,

they will go from birth in a great kṣatriya family comparable to a great sāla tree (**kṣatriyamahāsālakula*) to being reborn among the gods of the stage of neither consciousness nor unconsciousness (**naivasamjñānāsamjñāyatano-paga*). They will be reborn even in purified buddha-fields. Meeting the buddhas, blessed ones, without delay those donors and benefactors will, until they awaken to unexcelled perfect awakening, be those who will inspire those monks who dwell in accord with the teachings.

Great king. If anyone of your children, siblings, learned men or ministers were possessed of a fault, wherever there were a royal festival or royal holiday and the king was enjoying himself and having fun there, what do you think, Great king: would that boy, sitting in front of you experience happiness and joy, would he be able to dwell with various pleasures and fun?"

The king said: "Venerable, Blessed One, no. That boy would not be able to appear before me, much less to experience happiness and joy."

The Blessed One said: "Great king. Just so, whatever person were to keep someone's male and female slaves, or keep items ranging from their household goods through their field goods and their sheep, I am not his teacher, and he is not my disciple. He is someone who does injury to all the perfect buddhas of the three times. He is not permitted to live in accord with the teaching in those places which have been so presented as dwelling places for those who dwell in accord with the teaching. Whatever kṣatriya, brāhmaṇa, vaiśya, or śūdra does something for an evil monk devoted to attachments, that kṣatriya through śūdra who does not permit him to go from there does a great injury to all the buddhas, blessed ones of the three times. Though he offered many donations, still upon his death he will be reborn in the great Avīci hells.

"Great king, therefore by looking into the benefit to oneself one will not dwell on the side of the evil monk devoted to attachments. Why? Because he does injury to all gods and men, he does not benefit them, he exists in order to destroy them, he exists in order to bring to naught the lineage of the three jewels. Great king. Some kṣatriya, brāhmaṇa, vaiśya, or śūdra if he dwells on the side of the teaching of the monks who dwell in accord with the teaching, not on the side of those evil monks, even if he does not offer donations, still, because he is on the side of the teaching, is a noble

benefactor of all the buddhas, blessed ones, of the three times. Because he defends the noble teaching it is clear that he is a noble upholder of the noble teaching. Even upon his death after being reborn in pure buddha fields, without delay he will awaken to unexcelled, perfect awakening. Great king. Therefore, since I have delivered into your hand, fit kṣatriya, the dwelling and teaching according to the teaching, during the dwelling in the last five hundred years you must hold to dwelling according to the law. Because of that circumstance this teaching of mine and the lineage of the three jewels will exist for a long time, and gods and men will benefit and be happy.”

Finally, we may quote a rather radical passage from the *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā*.

Here the concern is explicitly with future degenerate monks. The reader can almost taste the bile the authors must have been spitting out as they recited these verses:¹

Where there is no self taught, and no living being, and no person, in any way at all, the exertion which strives to practice discipline and carry out the vows is useless. If there is a Mahāyāna, but in it there is no self, or living being, or human, then exertion in that Mahāyāna is useless, since I will not perceive any self or living being there. — These statements are just made up out of whole cloth, the products of those with evil minds and those with heretical thoughts! The Victor would never say such a thing, for this reviles the monks.

Deprived of modesty, shame and the precepts, arrogant like crows, haughty and overly confident, burned by jealousy, pride and arrogance [such] monks will appear in my community. Shaking their hands and feet [not keeping their bodies under control], sloppily letting the edges of their monastic robes hang down, wrapping the robes around their necks without care, they go to houses in the villages drunk with intoxicating pride. Taking up the banner of the buddha [= the robes?] they act as servants for the people of the villages. They always carry about a book, although they have thrown away the [texts] which are a mass of merit providing the teaching to people. They receive cows, asses, and horses, beasts, male slaves, and female slaves too, and with minds intent on ploughing and trade, they are always non-

¹ See the Textual Sources at the end of the chapter for the material translated here.

nobles. For them there is nothing at all which is to be called “ignoble,” nor anything at all which is not to be done. Possessions belonging to the stūpa, to the community or to individuals are all the same to them. Seeing monks who are wealthy in virtue they speak ill of them too. Those fraudulent precept breakers, deceivers, enter a village and those terrible ones violate the women. Householders are not covetous of sensual pleasures to the degree that those renunciants are covetous. They will have wives, sons, and daughters, and be exactly like householders. Even in that house where they are honored as those whose possessions are only a robe and begging bowl, those non-nobles, always under the power of defilements, lust even for the wife of that household.

“You must never fall prey to these lusts. They will cast you down into the realms of beasts, hungry ghosts, or hells.” Though they always speak like this to householders, they themselves are unrestrained and not calmed. Just as they themselves are unrestrained, the groups of their students too are not well-restrained. Those students pass the days and nights in talking of eating and sexual indulgence. They give their [students] friendly attention in order to be served, not in order to cultivate merit. “Surrounded by a group of my own pupils, I will always be worshipped by the people of the world.” And they even tell people “this friendly attention is due to my compassion. I never search for worshipful attention from those groups of my pupils at all.”

They will become exceedingly sick, leprous, their bodies extremely deformed in multiple ways, and they will enter into hell, coming again and again, always non-nobles. Deprived of the teaching and the restraint of the vows, they will always be detached from the merits of monks. They are neither householders nor monks, and people avoid them like tree in a cemetery. They will have no respect for the rules of training, or for the Prātimokṣa and Vinaya, they move about unchecked, according to their own volition, like a great elephant released from the goad. Even when they dwell in the forest they will have minds which are set on the village. Their minds are burned by the fire of the defilements, and are never settled. Forgetting all the virtues of the buddha, and the trainings and the ascetic purification practices, and the skillful means as well, filled with pride, arrogance and insolence they tumble into the frightful Avīci hell. Always delighting in talk

about kings, and reciting the tales of thieves, and devoted to relatives and familiars they think about such things night and day. Abandoning meditation-trance as well as study, they work constantly as functionaries carrying out the monastery's affairs. Greedy for sitting mats, frowning, they are surrounded by undisciplined disciples.

"I am the building supervisor here in this monastery; I built it for myself. There is room in this monastery for those monks who are faithful to me." To those who are precept keepers, full of virtue, upholding the teaching, devoted to the welfare of the people, always intent on controlling and restraining themselves they give no friendly attention. "This cave is designated as mine, and this one for my fellow practitioner, and this one for my companion. Get out! There is no dwelling here for you. The sitting mats and bedding are completely given out, many monks are already staying here, and there is no possibility to obtain any possessions here. What will you eat here? Get out, monk!" There will never be any request for sitting mats and bedding from them [because they will take them at their leisure]. Storing up things like householders, they will have numerous items of merchandise, and numerous followers.

And in the last time my progeny will be reviled from every side. And then recalling my words, they will go to live in border regions. Alas, the teaching of the excellent Victor will approach destruction in a short time, when there have appeared many monks overcome with desire for possessions, hating virtue. And those, committed to the precepts and the virtues, who in the last time are always disrespected will abandon the villages, and capital cities, and go to dwell in the wilderness. Although they will be honored, they are destitute of virtue, divisive tale bearers, lovers of strife, and although they are regarded as teachers by the people, they will be burned by arrogance and pride.

I think it has become clear from these passages, which could easily be multiplied many times over, that there is a widespread concern in Buddhist literature with the precept breaking monk, and that this concern need not necessarily be connected with any external conditions such as threats to Buddhism from without. I mention this latter issue

because, especially in the case of the *Sūryagarbhasūtra*, there may be some indications that its Central Asian origins are revealed in its explicit concern with external as well as internal threats to Buddhism.¹

We have seen, therefore, a rather unforgiving attitude toward wayward monks. However, the tradition is not univocal here (as it rarely is anywhere else either). For there do exist some texts which seem to suggest a certain amount of tolerance toward even precept breakers. We may note here an interesting passage from the *Kṣitigarbhasūtra*, quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*:²

The monk, Mahābrahma, who has renounced the world in my name, although he may be a precept breaker, of evil behavior, blind (?), internally of a rotten nature, one who while not a śramaṇa falsely claims to be a śramaṇa, who while not a keeper of the practice of purity falsely claims to be a keeper of the practice of purity, covered and overcome on all sides by various defilements, still even now is a preacher for all the gods, all humans, and all those who are endowed with virtue, and he is their good friend. However, he is not a fit vessel, but with his shaven head and face, undertaking his modes of deportment clothed in the monastic robes, even though this is done only for show, he [still] inspires many beings to plant the roots of good and shows them the path to good destinies. Therefore, when one has renounced the world in my name, whether he be a precept keeper or a precept breaker, I do not permit even universal emperors, even when they have justice on their side,

¹ In this regard, see also the passages quoted in the translation notes to II.3, especially that from the *Lianhuamian-jing*, and the paper of Yamada cited there. See also the remarks of Nattier 1991, *passim*.

² *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 67.19-68.7: *yo mahābrahman mamoddīśya pravrajito duḥśīlapāpasamācāro bhikṣur anubhūtaḥ*¹ *kaśambakajāto aśramaṇāḥ śramaṇapratijñāḥ abrahmacāriṇo brahmacāriprati-jñāḥ / dhvastaḥ paritāḥ parājito vividhaiḥ kleśaiḥ / atha ca punaḥ sa duḥśīlapāpasamācāro bhikṣur adyāpi sarvadevānāṃ yāvat sarvamanuṣyānāṃ yāvat puṇyanidhīnāṃ darśayitā bhavati kalyāṇa-mitraṃ / kim cāpi sa apātribhūtaḥ tena ca punaḥ śīrastuṇḍamuṇḍena kāśāyavastra-prāvaraṇeryā-pathena darśanahetunāpi bahūnāṃ satvānāṃ vividhakuśalamūlopastambhanakaraḥ sugatimārga-darśako bhavati / tasmād yo mamoddīśya pravrajitaḥ śīlavān duḥśīlo vā tasya nānujānāmi cakravarttirājñāṃ api yaṃ mamoddīśya pravrajitas ya sahadharmaṇāpi kāye daṇḍaprahāraṃ vā dātum cārake vā prakṣeptum / aṅgamaṅgaṃ vikarttanam vā kartum jīvitād vā vyaparopāṇam kartum kim punar adharmaṇa /* 1) Tibetan (Derge 43b4) has *mdongs pa* for *anubhūta*. Is the latter therefore an error for **andhaka*?

to inflict physical punishment on him, or throw him into prison, or to cut him limb from limb, or to deprive him of life, much less unjustly.

It could be argued, of course, that the point of this passage is not to advocate tolerance of precept breaking monks within the Buddhist community, monastic or otherwise, but rather to press home the point that, with regard to the temporal authorities, it was the business of the Buddhist community to take care of their own, and the crown had no right to interfere. A determination of the stance of this sūtra with regard to this issue would require a comprehensive study not of this isolated passage but of the text as a whole, and as I am unable to undertake such a study at present, I am forced to leave this problem here.

I alluded above to the whole complicated question of Buddhism and time, and especially in the present context the question of future decline of the doctrine. This is a very complicated issue, and to be sure there is no one single traditional position — different spokesmen offer different opinions. Jan Nattier has recently published a study of one example of this literature of decline, concentrating on time tables for the destruction and disappearance of the “true law.”¹

It would be too much to say that the authors of the *Ratnarāṣi* were not aware of such a scheme, for it seems to have been wide spread enough that we may presume the general outlines of the ideas to have been more or less well known. But this is not the scheme most clearly traceable in the background of the *Ratnarāṣi*. Rather, we have seen that already in nearly the earliest Buddhist literature a concern with corrupt monks, those within the Buddhist community who lose sight of its proper goals and ideals, seeking instead to take advantage of the “easy life” afforded by the monkhood. For this is a life in which one can, if one wishes, obtain food and lodging without the necessity to work

¹ Nattier 1991.

for it. The *Ratnarāśi* seems to represent a trend in Buddhist thought not oriented so much toward future calamity or decline as toward slow but constant internal corruption. This is, of course — and this is part of the point — not unique to the *Ratnarāśi*. It might be one topic for future research to see whether we can more accurately categorize the types of ideologies of decline represented in Buddhist literature, starting of course with the distinction between internal and external threats to the community.

Perhaps the key point in all this talk about good and bad monks, in the end, comes down not so much to whether the monk will find liberation for himself — for the text does not address this problem at all — but rather whether he will be able to provide an opportunity for lay devotees to generate merit. It is perhaps a remarkable feature of the *Ratnarāśi*, again in common with the character of much Vinaya literature, that the (or at least a) motivating factor for the adherence to proper behavior and avoidance of improper behavior is precisely the approval or approbation such will bring from lay supporters of the monastic community. I turn now to a more detailed consideration of this point.

Textual Sources:

I) *Buddhapitakaduḥśīlanigrahī*: Derge 220: *mdo sde, dza* 23a5-25b1;
 Peking 886: *mdo, tshu* 23b3-25b5 = sTog 36 *mdo, kha* 351b7-54b7 = Chinese T. 653
 (XV) 788b12-789a2:

*shā ri'i bu gzhan yang tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong ni gzhan gyis bsags pa'i
 longs spyod kyis lus gso bar byed do // shā ri'i bu nga ni de lta bu'i dge slong la khur
 khyer ba yin no zhes gsung ngo // de ci'i phyir zhe na / shā ri'i bu ngas rigs pa can dang
 / grol ba can rnams la ni dad pas byin pa rjes su gnang ngo // shā ri'i bu yang tshul
 khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong ni / rigs pa med pa nyid kyis grol ba ma yin no //*

*shā ri'i bu de lta bas na tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong gis bskal pa bye ba
 phrag brgya stong du yan lag dang / nying lag gi sha gtubs kyang slar sor chud par
 'gyur pa'i gnas de ni yod pa ma yin no // dud 'gro'i skye gnas su gtogs pa glang dang
 bong bu'i khur len par 'gyur pas de slar sor chud par 'gyur ba'i gnas de ni yod pa ma yin
 no // de ci'i phyir zhe na / shā ri'i bu 'di ltar tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong rnams
 kyis dad pas byin pa la bye ba brgya stong du gshags pa'i cha shas kyang yongs su
 sbyang bar mi nus na / chos gos sam / bsod snyoms lta smos kyang ci dgos te de ni gnas
 yod pa ma yin no // shā ri'i bu ngas drang srong gi rgyal mtshan gyis g-yogs pa tshul
 khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong ni gtsug lag khang gi gzhi la gom pa gcig kyang 'dor bar rjes
 su ma gnang na / chu'i snod lta ci smos / khri 'am khri 'u lta ci smos / de ci'i phyir zhe
 na / shā ri'i bu skyes bu dam pa ma yin pa de dag ni lha dang bcas pa'i 'jig rten gyi
 chom rkun pa yin pa'i phyir ro // shā ri'i bu skyes bu dam pa ma yin pa de dag ni lha
 dang bcas pa'i 'jig rten gyis bskrad par bya ba'i 'os yin no // shā ri'i bu skyes bu dam pa
 ma yin pa de dag ni lha dang bcas pa'i 'jig rten gyi dgra po yin te / de dag ni sdig pa'i
 grogs po zhes bya'o // shā ri'i bu ngas lha dang bcas pa'i 'jig rten la chos bstan pa'i
 phyir skabs dbye par bya'o // shā ri'i bu nga ni tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong tshul
 khrims nyams pa / spyod pa nyams pa / 'tsho ba nyams pa / lta ba nyams pa rnams ni lag
 brdas skrod par mdzad do // de dag ni ngas blta ba'i phyir yang skabs ma phye na /
 bstan pa 'di la mtshan gcig gam / nyin gcig gam / skad cig tsam nye bar 'gro ba'i phyir
 lta ci smos /*

*shā ri'i bu dper na / sbrul gyi ro 'am / khyi ro 'am / mi ro mi gtsang ba rul pa / dri
 mi zhim ba dag ni lha'i 'khor dang 'thun pa ma yin zhing 'dod pa'i rtsed mo rnams dang
 yang 'thun pa ma yin te / gal te de dag mthong na / rgyang ring po kho na nas yongs su*

spong bar byed do // shā ri'i bu de bzhin du mkhas pa rnams kyis tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong yang sbrul gyi ro dang 'dra bar rig par bya ste / 'di ltar de ni rgyang ring por yongs su sbang bar bya'o // de dag dang bkra shis kyi las sam / gso sbyong ngam / dgag dbye yang lhan cig tu mi bya'o //

de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'di ltar skyes bu blun po de dag ni yun ring por gnod pa dang / phan pa ma yin pa dang / bde ba ma yin pa dang / sdug bsngal ba dang / nyams ba dang / gzhan gyis zil gyis mnan pa dang / log par lhung ba kun tu rdzogs par 'gyur ba yin pa'i phyir ro // tshul khrims dang ldan pa'i dge slong gang yin pa dag la gus par mi byed / dge sbyong ma yin par dge sbyong du khas 'che / tshangs par spyod pa ma yin par tshangs par spyod par khas 'che zhing / bya ba dang / las dang / gso sbyong ba dang / dgag dbye rnams 'dral bar byed do //

shā ri'i bu nga'i bstan pa 'di la tshul khrims dang ldan par bkur ba'i dge slong gang yin pa de dag gis / tshul khrims 'chal ba'i dge slong rnams mthong na / rgyang ring po kho nar yongs su spong bar 'gyur ro // de ci'i phyir zhe na / shā ri'i bu 'di ltar tshul khrims 'chal ba'i dge slong rnams kyi lhung bzed dam / chos gos gang yin pa de dag dang / tshul khrims dang ldan pa'i dge slong rnams kyir 'dres na / dug dang 'dres pa lta bur rig par bya'o // shā ri'i bu nga ni sbrul gyi ros gang ba 'am / khyi ros gang ba 'am / mi ros gang ba'i sa la spyod lam bzhi po rnams las spyod lam gang yang rung bas gnas par ni spro yi / shā ri'i bu nga ni tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong spyod [P sbyong for slong spyod] pa nyams pa / 'tsho ba nyams pa / lta ba nyams pa rnams dang / mtshan gcig gam / nyin gcig gam / skad cig gam / tha na se gol gtogs pa tsam yang lhan cig tu gnas par mi spro'o // de ci'i phyir zhe na / shā ri'i bu 'di ltar de lta bu'i dge sbyong [P slong] rnams ni dge sbyong [P slong] tha shal zhes bya'o // dge sbyong bkren ba zhes bya'o // dge sbyong phal pa zhes bya'o // dge sbyong sbun pa zhes bya'o // dge sbyong rul pa zhes bya'o // dge sbyong dri can zhes bya'o // dge sbyong gi snyigs ma zhes bya'o // dge sbyong gi dri ma zhes bya'o // dge sbyong gdol pa zhes bya'o // dge sbyong nyams pa zhes bya'o // dge sbyong sdig can zhes bya'o // dge sbyong sre da zhes bya'o // 'phags pa'i lam las phyi rol pa zhes bya'o // dge sbyong chu skyar zhes bya'o // dge sbyong sun 'byin pa zhes bya ste / de dag nga'i bstan pa 'di la rab tu byung nas [? read na?] / bsod nams ma yin pa'i phung po mang du 'thob par gyur ro // shā ri'i bu de dag ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan pa la [R ø] 'thab khrol ba yin no // shā ri'i bu de dag ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan pa la [R ø] chom rkun chos sun 'byin pa yin no // shā ri'i bu skyes bu dam pa ma yin pa de dag ni tshul 'chos pa 'tsho ba lhur len ba / 'jig rten gyi zang zing gis bkol ba / zas dang bgo ba lhur len pa yin no //

*shā ri'i bu dper na ma ning ni bud med kyang ma yin / skyes pa yang ma yin no
zhes brjod par bya'o // shā ri'i bu de bzhin du tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong yang
khyim pa yang ma yin / dge sbyong yang ma yin no zhes brjod par bya ste / de'i tha snyad
kyi bden pa'i tshig gi don gyi bla dags ni sems can dmyal ba zhes bya ba kho na yin no //*

*shā ri'i bu dper na bya ma byi ni 'dab chags kyi brel pa byung na ni phug tu
zhugs nas / byi ba'i 'du shes 'byin to // byi ba'i brel ba byung na ni mdab chags rnams
kyi grangs kyi kha skong bar byed do // de la ni bya ba dang bskyod pa'i mthu yod pa ma
yin / skad dang gdangs chen po 'byin pa ma yin / kha dog bzang po dang / ngan pa'i gnas
rnams bstan du med de / 'di ltar mun khung nyid la sten pa dang / de bdag nyid kyi rang
bzhin yang dri mi zhim ba yin no // shā ri'i bu de bzhin du tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge
slong yang bya ba dang bskyod pa la mthu med par 'gyur te / rgyal po'i las la ni dge
sbyong dang thun mong / bzang po'i las la ni khyim pa dang thun mong du byed de / de
lta bas na de ni khyim pa yang ma yin / dge sbyong yang ma yin par brjod par bya'o // ro
'am mgal me'i 'khor lo bzhin du bya ba dang g-yo ba yongs su nyams pas/ de nyid kyi
tshul khrims kyi dri yod pa ma yin / ting nge 'dzin gyi dri yod pa ma yin / shes rab kyi dri
yod pa ma yin / rnam par grol ba'i dri yod pa ma yin / rnam par grol ba'i ye shes mthong
ba'i dri yod pa ma yin gyi / gzhan du na de la tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dri kho na yod do //
dge sbyong dang 'dra ba'i skad dang gtam / 'di lta ste / tshul khrims kyi gtam 'am
/ ting nge 'dzin gyi gtam 'am / shes rab kyi gtam 'am / rnam par grol ba'i gtam 'am /
rnam par grol ba'i ye shes mthong ba'i gtam 'am / 'bras bu thob pa'i gtam mngon par mi
brjod kyi / gzhan du na tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong ni 'du 'dzi la dga' zhing mngon
par mgu par byed pa kho na yin no // de ni rigs pa ma yin pa la sbyor ba de 'dra ba dag
dang lhan cig ma dag pa'i gtam mang po 'di lta ste / chos gos bgos pa'i gtam dang /
bdag gis kha zas rnyed nas zos pa'i gtam dang / sbyin pa byin na byin len bya ba'i gtam
dang / pho nya dang spring yig skyel ba'i gtam dang / lo ma dang / me tog dang / 'bras
bu sbyin pa'i gtam dang / gzhad [P bzhad] gad dang rtsed mo dang kun tu 'brel pa dang /
gdul dka' ba dang / dgang dka' ba dang / gso dka' ba smra ste / gtam 'di 'dra ba ma dag
pa dag gis nyin mtshan lhag par 'da' bar byed do // de ltar de dag yongs su ma dag pa'i
lus kyi las kyi mtha' dang / yongs su ma dag pa'i ngag gi las kyi mtha' dang / yongs su
ma dag pa'i yid kyi las kyi mtha' dang / yongs su ma dag pa'i 'tsho bas lus zhig nas shi
ba'i 'og tu ngan song ngan 'gro log par ltung ba sems can dmyal ba rnams su ltung bar
'gyur ro //*

*shā ri'i bu dper na bya ma byi ni mun khrod na sten pa yin no zhes gsungs so //
skyes bu blun po de dag kyang de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs pa'i mdo sde yang dag pa ji*

lta ba bzhin skul bar byed pa 'di lta bu thos nas sdug bsngal bar 'gyur ro // de ci'i phyir zhe na / shā ri'i bu 'di ltar 'jig rten ni bden pa la khro ba yin pas / de dag chos smra ba la sems ma dad par 'gyur ro // de dag lhag par yang ngan song gi gnas kun tu 'phel ba dang / yongs su rdzogs par byed par 'gyur ro //

shā ri'i bu 'di ni tshul khrims 'chal pa'i dge slong gi 'chal pa'i tshul khrims kyi skon lnga pa yin te / ngan song yongs su rdzogs par bya ba'i phyir zhugs pa yin no //

II) *Sūryagarbhasūtra*: The Tibetan text is from the Derge Kanjur 257: *mdo sde, za, 103b5-106b5*, the corresponding Chinese is T. 397 (XIII) 237c6-238c27:

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / rgyal po chen po de bzhin du gang tshul khrims 'chal pa sdig pa'i chos kun tu spyod pa / shing rul pa lta bur gyur pa / dge sbyong ma yin par dge sbyong du khas 'che ba / tshangs par spyod pa ma yin par tshangs par spyod par khas 'che ba'i gang zag de lta bu ni 'das pa dang / ma byon pa dang / da ltar gyis sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das thams cad la gnod pa yin te / de ni bcom ldan 'das kyi nyan thos ma yin zhing bdud kyi stobs kyi rigs kyis zin pa yin no // gang zag de ni lam nyam nga ba la gnas pa yin te / de ni phyis kyang nyan thos kyi dge 'dun gyi nang du bgrang ba ma yin no // de bzhin du der 'jug par bya ba ma yin te / dge slong chos kyis gnas pa rnams la bsngos na tha na til gyi <104a> phub ma tsam yang longs spyod par 'os pa ma yin na / dge 'dun gyi nang du nye bar longs spyod par bya ba lta smos kyang ci dgos te / de ni chos 'dul ba 'dis bor pa yin no //

rgyal po gzugs can snying pos 'di skad ces gsol to // btsun pa bcom ldan 'das spyod pa'i mtshan nyid kyi mtshan ma gang dag gis dge slong tshul khrims 'chal pa / sdig pa'i chos kun spyod pa / dge slong chos kyis gnas pa rnams kyi nang du slan chad gnas pa dang / longs spyod dang / nye bar spyod par bgyid par mi 'os par 'tshal lags /

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / rgyal po chen po rnam pa 'di lta bus tshul khrims 'chal pa'i mgo 'byung bar 'gyur ro // zhes gang gis kyang myur du rnam par shes par mi nus te / rgyal po chen po 'di ni nang gi dang por sangs rgyas la ma gus pa yin no // chos dang / dge 'dun dang / mkhan po dang / slob dpon dang / bla ma'i gnas lta bu rnams la ma gus pa yin / 'phags pa'i rigs btang ba yin / rnal 'byor yid la byed pa la kun dga' ba ma yin / ngo tsha shes pa dang / khrel yod pa rnam par spangs pa yin / khyim na gnas pa dang 'driś pa yin / tshig kyal pa smra ba yin / bdag la bstod pa yin / gzhan la smod pa yin / de lta bu dag la kun dga' ba yin / sdig pa'i snyi la chags pa yin / lam ngan par zhugs pa yin / khengs pa yin / kha drag pa yin / 'phral g-yar can yin / 'phyar po yin / kha shing can yin / g-yo sgyu can yin / sgyu byed pa yin / dge sbyong yon po yin / dge

sbyong g-yo can yin / dge slong snye long lta bu yin / dge slong gi dge 'dun mi 'thun par
 'dod par smra ba yin / rnyed pa dang / bkur sti dang / tshigs su bcad pa la mngon par
 dga' ba yin / 'du 'dzi'i kun dga' la dga' ba yin te / sdig pa can gyi dge slong tshul khrims
 'chal pa de ni ji srid du de'i tshul khrims 'chal pa'i mgo byung bar ma gyur gyi bar du
 gang gis kyang mtshan ma de dag gis myur du shes par mi nus so // sdig pa can gyi dge
 slong <104b> de gang gi tshe khyim gyi gzhi dang / zhing gi gzhi dang / kun dga' ra ba'i
 gzhi dang / bran dang / bran mo dang / glang po che dang / rta dang / rnga mo dang /
 bong bu dang / lug dag gang zag gir srel bar byed na de ni de'i tshul khrims 'chal ba'i
 mgo byung ba yin te / tshul khrims 'chal pa'i mgo des ni sdig pa can gyi dge slong de dge
 slong gi dge 'dun gyi nang nas dor ba yin / gnas par bya ba ma yin / longs spyod par bya
 ba ma yin / dge slong gi dngos po las lhung ba yin / pham par gyur pa yin te / dge slong
 gi tshul las kyang phyis¹ bslang du med par 'gyur ba yin no //

rgyal po chen po mi gdol pa gnas na gnas par byed pa ni sla'i / dge slong gdol pa
 yongs su 'dzin pa dang bcas pa / rgyud tshig pa / don la mi lta pa / 'jig rten pha rol btang
 ba / snying rje'i bsam pa med pa / phyi sa khung chen po dang 'dra ba / bdud kyi lam du
 zhugs pa / lha dang mi rnams la gnod pa byed pa / dus gsum thams cad kyi drang srong
 thub pa rnams la shu bar byed pa / dkon mchog gsum gyi gdung chos kyi mar me med par
 byed pa / chos kyi rgya mtsho skems par byed pa / chos smra ba'i dbyen byed pa / sbyin
 pa po dang sbyin bdag rnams la 'drid par byed pa / dge slong chos kyis gnas pa rnams la
 tho 'tsham par byed pa / dge 'dun 'thun par byed pa'i rgyun gcod par byed pa ni de lta ma
 yin no // sdig pa can gyi dge slong de ni yongs su 'dzin pa'i rkyen gyis mtho ris kyi lam
 las rgyal po ldog par byed pa yin no // rgyal rigs dang / bram ze dang / rje'u rigs dang /
 dmangs rigs dang / skyes pa dang / bud med dang / khye'u dang / bu mo ldog par byed pa
 yin no // ngan song gi lam gsum la rab tu gzhog par byed pa yin no // rgyal po chen po
 sdig pa can gyi dge slong de yongs su 'dzin pa'i rgyu mtshan gyis lha dang / mi ji snyed
 cig mi skyid par byed par 'gyur ba la ltos / rgyal po chen po de lta bas na yongs su 'dzin
 pa dang bcas pa'i dge slong dang / dge slong chos kyis <105a> gnas pa / yon tan gyis
 phyug pa dag dang lhan cig tu kun dga' ra ba gcig dang / gtsug lag khang gcig tu gnas
 par mi bya'o // gal te sdig pa can gyi dge slong de kha drag cing ngo tsha shes pa dang
 khrel yod pa rnam par spangs te / dge slong de dag dang lhan gcig gnas par byed na /
 de'i phyir dge slong chos kyis gnas pa de dag gis byams pa dang ldan zhing chos dang
 'thun bas dran bar bya ste / gal te sdig pa can gyi dge slong de gnas de nas 'gro blta na /

¹ Or read *phyir* with Mhy. 9133?

de lta na ni legs / gal te 'gro bar mi byed na der dge slong chos kyis gnas pa de dag dong
 la grong khyer dang / grong rdal dang / grong dang / ljongs dang / ri'or de dag na rgyal
 rigs sam / bram ze 'am / rje'u rigs sam / dmangs rigs gang dbang byed du 'jug pa de la
 sbran par bya'o // gal te rgyal rigs dang / bram ze dang / rje'u rigs dang / dmangs rigs
 des sdig pa can gyi dge slong yongs su 'dzin pa dang bcas pa gnas de nas zlog par byed
 na der ni dge slong chos kyis gnas pa de dag gis gnas par bya'o // ji ste rgyal rigs dang /
 bram ze dang / rje'u rigs dang / dmangs rigs de bza' ba dang / btung ba dang / rnyed pa'i
 rgyus sdig pa can gyi dge slong yongs su 'dzin pa dang bcas pa'i phyogs byed pa lta na /
 de'i phyir dge slong chos kyis gnas pa de dag gis khro ba bstan par mi bya'o // chags pa
 ma yin / nga rgyal ma yin te / 'on kyang cang mi smra bar gnas de nas 'gro bar bya zhing
 / dgon pa'i gnas sam / nags khrod dam / ri'am / ri bo'i 'or gzhan gang na sgra gcom
 chung ba dang / nang du yang dag 'jog dang 'tsham ba 'am / tshul bzhin du yid la byed pa
 dang 'thun pa der gnas par bya'o //

yang rgyal po gzugs can snying pos mchi ma phyung nas 'di skad ces gsol to //
 btsun pa bcom ldan 'das gang bza' ba dang / btung ba dang / rnyed pa'i slad du sdig pa
 can gyi dge slong yongs su 'dzin pa dang bcas pa'i phyogs bgyid cing / dge slong chos
 kyis gnas pa / yon tan gyis phyug pa rnams kyang gnas nas mchi <105b> bar 'gyur ba'i
 rgyal rigs dang / bram ze dang / rje'u rigs dang / dmangs rigs ni nyams pa lags so //
 btsun pa bde bar gshegs pa mchog tu nyams pa lags so // de'i mi nyid rnyed pa ni rnyed
 par dka' ba lags te / 'khor ba na 'khor bar bgyid pa de'i mi nyid rnyed pa'i tha ma ni de
 lags so // sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das thugs rje chen po dang ldan pa grangs ma mchis /
 dpag tu ma mchis pa gang gā'i klung gi bye ma snyed 'jig rten du 'byung bar 'gyur bas
 kyang / gang dge slong chos kyis gnas pa rnams kyi tshig gus par mi nyam pa'i sems can
 de ni ngan song rnams las yongs su thar par bgyi ba 'am / miho ris su gzhas par mi
 spyod de / de ni sdig pa'i las de lta bu dang ldan par 'gyur lags so //

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / rgyal po chen po ma 'ongs ba'i dus na la lar
 gang dge slong chos kyis gnas pa rnams la shin tu dad pa'i rgyal rigs dang / bram ze
 dang / rje'u rigs dang / dmangs rigs dag 'byung bar 'gyur te / de dag gi don du dgon pa'i
 gnas dag byed par 'gyur ro // gtsug lag khang dang / dgon pa'i gnas der yang khyim gyi
 gzhi nas zhing gi gzhi dang / bran dang / bran mo dang / kun dga' ra ba'i bar de dag gi
 longs spyod dang / nye bar spyod pa'i phyir yongs su gtong ba byed par 'gyur ro // de
 dag 'chi ba'i dus byas nas kyang rgyal rigs shing sā la chen po lta bu dag tu skye bar
 'gyur ba nas / 'du shes med 'du shes med min skye mched kyi lha rnams kyi nang du skye
 ba'i bar du 'gyur ro // sangs rgyas kyi zhing yongs su dag pa dag tu yang skye bar 'gyur

ro // sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rnams dang yang phrad par 'gyur ba nas ring po mi
thogs par sbyin pa po dang / sbyin bdag de dag bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i
byang chub mngon par rdzogs par 'chang rgya ba'i bar du 'gyur te / de dag ni nga'i bstan
pa la dge slong chos kyi gnas pa rnams yang dag par 'dzin par byed par 'gyur ba yin no
//

rgyal po chen po 'di lta ste / gang khyod kyi bu'am / spun nam / <106a> bkrabs pa
'am / sna chen po la gtogs pa gang yang rung ba zhig nyes pa dang bcas pa yin na / gang
dang gang du rgyal po chen po'i dus ston nam dga' ston byung ba der rgyal po chen pos
dga' ba dang bde ba rnam pa sna tshogs nyams su myong bar byed na / rgyal po chen po
'di ji snyam du sems / skyes bu de khyod kyi mdun du 'dug cing skyid pa dang rtse ba
myong bar byed pa 'am / dga' ba dang bde ba rnam pa sna tshogs kyi gnas par byed nas
sam /

rgyal po chen pos gsol pa / btsun pa bcom ldan 'das ma lags te / skyes bu des
bdag gi mdun na mchis par yang rngo mi thogs lags na skyid pa dang rtse ba myong bar
bgyid pa lta smos kyang ci 'tshal /

bcom ldan 'das kyi bka' stsal pa / rgyal po chen po de bzhin du gang zag gang
zhig gang zag gir bran dang / bran mo srel bar byed cing khyim gyi gzhi nas zhing gi
gzhi dang / lug dag gi bar srel bar byed na / nga yang de'i ston pa ma yin la / de yang
nga'i nyan thos ma yin no // dus gsum du gshegs pa'i yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs
rgyas thams cad la yang gnod par byed pa dang bcas pa yin no // de ni chos kyi¹ gnas
pa rnams kyi gnas de ltar bsngos pa dag tu chos dang 'thun pas gnas par 'os pa ma yin
no // rgyal rigs dang / bram ze dang / rje'u rigs dang / dmangs rigs gang yang sdig pa
can gyi dge slong yongs su 'dzin pa dang bcas pa de'i don byed pa dang / de nas 'gror mi
ster ba'i rgyal rigs nas dmangs rigs kyi bar de ni dus gsum du gshegs pa'i sangs rgyas
bcom ldan 'das thams cad la yang gnod pa byed pa dang bcas pa chen po yin no // sbyin
pa mang po sbyin par byed du zin kyang 'on kyang de 'chi ba'i dus byas nas mnar med
pa'i sems can dmyal ba chen po rnams kyi nang du skye bar 'gyur ro //

rgyal po chen po de lta bas na bdag la phan par yang dag par rjes su lta bas sdig
pa can gyi dge slong yongs su 'dzin pa dang bcas pa'i phyogs su gnas par mi bya'o // de
ci'i phyir zhe na / 'di ltar de ni lha dang mi thams cad la <106b> yang gnod pa dang /
phan pa ma yin pa dang / log par ltung bar bya ba'i phyir zhugs pa dang / dkon mchog
gsum gyi gdung med par bya ba'i phyir zhugs pa yin pa'i phyir ro // rgyal po chen po

¹ Xylograph reads kyi.

rgyal rigs sam / bram ze 'am / rje'u rigs sam / dmangs rigs gang zhig dge slong chos kyis
 gnas pa rnam kyis chos kyis phyogs la yang dag par gnas bar byed cing / sdig pa can gyi
 dge slong rnam kyis phyogs la ma yin na / de sbyin pa mi sbyin du zin kyang 'on kyang de
 ni chos kyis phyogs kyis rgyu'i phyir dus gsum du gshegs pa'i sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das
 thams cad kyis sbyin bdag dam pa yin no // de ni dam pa'i chos rjes su bsrung ba'i phyir
 dam pa'i chos 'dzin pa dam pa yin par blta bar bya'o // 'chi ba'i dus byas nas kyang
 sangs rgyas kyis zhing yongs su dag pa rnam su skye bar 'gyur ba nas ring po mi thogs
 par bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mngon par rdzogs par 'tshang
 rgya bar du 'gyur ro // rgyal po chen po de lta bas na rgyal rigs 'tsham pa khyod kyis lag
 tu chos kyis gnas pa dang bstan pa ngas yongs su gtad kyis lnga brgya pa tha ma la gnas
 pa'i bar du khyed kyis nga'i chos kyis gnas pa dag yang dag par zung shig dang / de'i
 rkyen gyis nga'i chos kyis tshul 'di dang / dkon mchog gsum gyi gdung yun ring du gnas
 par 'gyur zhing / lha dang mi rnam la phan pa dang bde bar 'gyur ro // <106b5>

III) *Rāṣṭrapālāpariprcchā*. The text is from Finot 1901: 28.11-33.6, slightly modified in light of the corrections suggested by Shakelton Bailey and others, and in view of the Tibetan translation.

yatrāṭma nāsti na ca jīvo deśita pudglo 'pi na kathamcit /
 vyarthah śramo 'tra ghaṭate yaḥ śīlaprayoga saṁvarakriyā ca //
 yady asti caiva mahāyānam nātra hi ātmasatva manujo vā /
 vyarthah śramo 'tra hi kṛto me yatra na cātmasatva-upalabdhiḥ //
 kavītāni haiva svamatāni pāpamataiḥ kutīrthikamataiś ca /
 bhāṣeta no jina kadācit vācam imāṁ hi bhikṣuparibhāṣām //
 hīrapatrāpyaśīlarahitās ca dhvāṅksapragalbha-uddhatapracandāḥ /
 bhavitā hi bhikṣava mameha śāsani īrṣyamānamadadagdhāḥ //
 vidhyanta hasta tathā pādāmś cīvarakarṇakā nidhunantaḥ /
 kāṣāyakaṇṭha vicarantā grāmakuleṣu madyamadamatāḥ //
 buddhasya te dhvaja grhītvā sevakarā grhasthajanatāyām /
 lekham vahanti satatam te śāsanadam viḥaya guṇarāṣim //
 gogardabhāśvapaśudāsa sambhavate dāsya api teṣām /
 kṛṣikarmavāṇijyaprayogā yuktamanās ca te nityam anāryāḥ //
 naiṣām anāryam api vācyam naiva ca kimcid asti yad akāryam /
 staupika sāmghikam hy api ca vittam paudgalikam ca tac ca samam eṣām //

bhikṣuṇa vikṣya ca guṇādhyam teṣv api cāpy avarṇa kathayanti /
 duḥśīlavañcaka praviśya kuhās te strī ca vināśayanti hi sughorāḥ //
 grddho grhī na tathā kāmair yādr̥ṣe pravrajitva te grddhāḥ /
 bhāryāḥ sutā duhitaraś ca teṣu bhaviṣya grhisamānam //
 yatraiva satkṛta kule te cīvarapiṇḍapātaparibhogaiḥ /
 tasyaiva dāraparigrddhā kleśavaśānugāḥ sada anāryāḥ //
 kāmā ime khalu na sevyāḥ pātana tiryakpretanirayeṣu /
 vakṣyanti te sada grhīṇā te ca svayam adānta anupaśāntāḥ //
 svayam eva te yatha adāntāḥ śiṣyagaṇo 'pi teṣa na sudāntaḥ /
 āhāramaitihunakathāyām rātridivāni teṣu gamiṣyanti //
 sevārtham eva na guṇārtham te khalu saṁgraham dadati teṣām /
 śiṣyaganaiḥ svakaiḥ parivṛto 'ham pūja jane sadātra ca labhiṣya //
 kathayanti te 'pi ca janasya saṁgraha eṣa me karuṇayaiśām /
 upasthāna prārthayāmi tebhya śiṣyaganebhya eva na kadācit //
 rogābhībhūtabahu tatra kuṣṭhilāś citragātrasuvirūpāḥ /
 pravrajiṣyanti nara teṣu āgatā āgatā sada anāryāḥ //
 uddesaśaṁvaravihīnā bhikṣuguneṣu te sada viyuktāḥ /
 grhīno na te 'pi na ca bhikṣū varjita te yathā śmaśāna iva dāruḥ //
 śikṣāsu cādara na teṣām syān na ca pratimokṣavinaye vā /
 uddāmagāḥ svavaśagās te ankuśamuktakā iva gajendrāḥ //
 vanavāsinām api hi teṣām grāmagataḥ bhaviṣyati hi cittam /
 kleśāgninā pratapitānām cittam avasthitam hi na ca teṣām //
 vismr̥tya buddhaguṇasarvān śikṣadhutāmś ca te 'pi ca upāyān /
 madamānadarpaparipūrṇā te prapatanti dāruṇam avicīm //
 rājakathāratās ca satatam te corakathābhikārttanaratās ca /
 jñātiniṣevane ca niratās te cintayamāna rātrimdivasāni //
 dhyānam tathādhyayanam tyaktvā nitya vihāra karmaṇi niyuktāḥ /
 āvāsaḥ grdhra bhr̥kuṭikās te ca adāntaśiṣyaparivārāḥ //
 navakarmiko hy aham vihāre ātmanahetur eṣa hi kṛto me /
 ye bhikṣavo mamānukūlās teṣv avakāśam asti hi vihāre //
 ye śīlavanta guṇavanto dharmadharā janārtham abhiyuktāḥ /
 damasaṁyame satata yuktāḥ saṁgraha teṣu te na kurute ca //
 layanam mamaitad uddiṣṭam sārḍhavihāriṇo 'pi ca mamedam /
 saṁmodikasya ca mamedam gaccha na te 'sti vāsa iha kaścit //

śayyāsanam nikhiladattam bhikṣavaḥ sthāpitā iha prabhūtāḥ /
 na ca lābhasambhava ihāsti kiṃ paribhokṣyase 'tra vraja bhikṣo //
 śayyāsanoddīṣana teṣāṃ naiva bhaviṣyate 'pi ca kadācit /
 grhisamcayāś ca bhavitāras te ca prabhūtabhāṇḍaparivārāḥ //
 nirbhartsitāpi ca samantāt te hi mamaurasāś carimakāle /
 vacanam ca te mama hi smṛtvā prāntavane tadābhinivasanti //
 hā śāsanam jinavarasya nāśam upeṣya hi na cireṇa /
 lābhābhibhūtaguṇadvīṣṭhā bhikṣavaḥ prādurbhūta bahu yatra //
 paribhūtakāś ca satatam te paścimakāli śīlaguṇayuktāḥ /
 te cāpy aranyavanavāsī grāma vihāya rāṣṭranagarāṇi //
 sada satkṛtā guṇavihīnā bhedakasūcakāḥ kalahakāmāḥ /
 te śāstrsammata janasya te ca bhaviṣyanti mānamadadagdhāḥ //

Chapter 5

The Merit of the Monk

The subject of the suitability of a monk to receive *dāna*, or the gifts given by donors, was a major concern for the authors of the *Ratnarāśi*, and this topic provides the stage upon which is played out one of the dramatic moments of the sūtra, the departure from the assembly of five hundred monks who hold themselves to be unworthy of receiving alms from pious donors.¹ Those five hundred monks feel that their own lack of moral and spiritual purity makes them unable to “purify” the pious gift (“gift of faith”) presented as alms by the donors. Consequently, were they to accept the gifts they would be cheating the donors out of the rightful meritorious reward their gifts would be expected to produce if presented to a suitable recipient. This idea that only a proper recipient may provide benefit for the donor is central to this ideology. The unworthy recipient’s acceptance of a gift of faith leads both his benefactor and himself into hell.

The relevant passages in the sūtra may be summarized as follows:²

The Buddha teaches: “If there is one who while not a śramaṇa falsely claims to be śramaṇa, while not a follower of the practice of purity falsely claims to be a follower of the practice of purity, that fool is unworthy of any gift of faith at all. Such a person cannot purify a gift of faith even as small as the point of the tip of a hair. Why? Because the community of the saints is like the ocean, it is a field of merit and the best of those worthy of reverence. Faithful brahmins or householders might make offerings to that false śramaṇa with the idea that those offerings are infinite, if the stupid precept-breaker were to enjoy even the tiniest gift of faith, as small as his enjoyment

¹ One might also say, perhaps somewhat cynically, “the only dramatic moment in the sūtra.”

² *Ratnarāśi* I.11-16.

of a gift of faith as, so correspondingly great an ocean of evil karma would he amass. Therefore, gifts of faith are to be enjoyed by those who are pure in their practice of the precepts.”

When that teaching was preached, two hundred *yogācāra* monks heard it and wept, and with flowing tears said: “Even though we may die, as long as we have not obtained the fruit of the *śramaṇa* state we should not enjoy even one rice-ball given by the faithful.” The Blessed One said: “Worthy men, good! Good! By being modest, full of regret, and fearful of censure in the other world you beautify this preaching.”

The Buddha continues: “I permit the gift of faith to two types of *śramaṇas*: The one who is intent, and the one who is liberated. If that intent monk consumes even mouthfuls of food as great as Mount Sumeru given as gifts of faith, the offerings made to him become completely and totally pure. When that monk enjoys the gift of faith, the maturation of merit from that gift which accrues to those donors has great power and benefit. Whichever *śramaṇa*, having enjoyed the gift of faith from a donor, should cause him disaster due to his failure to uphold the precepts must see how much damage he causes later.

And again, in Chapter Three:¹

When this teaching had been preached, five-hundred *yogācāra* monks thought: “Since we do not purify the precepts, if we were to enjoy the gift of faith it would not be right,” and being dejected they went back home. Then a few other monks criticized them saying: “It is very bad that these *yogācārins* are dejected by the teaching.”

The Buddha says: “Monks! You must not say this. When monks become displeased with their behavior as monks, it is the proper course for those possessed of faith to return to the home life. Those monks of great faith and conviction having heard this teaching became despondent and thought: “We did not purify the precepts and so it is not right that we enjoy the gift of faith.” Kāśyapa, I predict that these monks will be reborn among the assembly of gods of Tuṣita, and will be among the members of the first assembly of disciples of the Tathāgata Maitreya.”

¹

Ratnarāśi III.19-20.

This is an idea found not only in the *Ratnarāṣi*, of course, but also in numerous other Buddhist texts. Moreover, it is certainly not restricted to Buddhist ideology.

Almost exactly the same thing is said in the *Manusmṛti*:¹

A Brāhmaṇa who neither performs austerities nor studies the Veda, yet delights in accepting gifts, sinks with the donor into hell, just as he who attempts to cross over in a boat made of stone is submerged in the water. Hence an ignorant man should be afraid of accepting presents from just anyone; for by reason of a very small gift even a fool sinks into hell as a cow

¹ IV.190-197. The translation is an abbreviated version based basically on that of Bühler 1886: 158-59, modified very slightly in light of Doniger and Smith 1991: 91-92. For non-grammatical parenthetical additions Bühler seems to have relied primarily on the commentary of Medhātithi. The text of the complete *Manusmṛti* reads:

A Brāhmaṇa who neither performs austerities nor studies the Veda, yet delights in accepting gifts, sinks with the donor into hell, just as he who attempts to cross over in a boat made of stone is submerged in the water. Hence an ignorant man should be afraid of accepting presents from just anyone; for by reason of a very small gift even a fool sinks into hell as a cow into a morass. A man who knows the law should not offer even water to a Brāhmaṇa who acts like a cat, nor an evil Brāhmaṇa who acts like a heron, nor to one who is unacquainted with the Veda. For property, though earned in accordance with prescribed rules, which is given to these three persons, causes in the next world misery both to the giver and the recipient. As he who attempts to cross water in a boat of stone sinks to the bottom, even so an ignorant donor and an ignorant recipient sink low. A man who, ever covetous, displays the flag of virtue, who is a hypocrite, a deceiver of people, intent on doing injury, and a detractor from the merits of all men, one must know to be one who acts like a cat. That Brāhmaṇa, who with downcast look, of a cruel disposition, is solely intent on attaining his own ends, dishonest and falsely gentle, is one who acts like a heron. Those Brāhmaṇas who act like herons, and those who display the characteristics of cats, fall in consequence of that wicked mode of acting into the hell called Andhatāmisra.

atapās tv anadhīyānaḥ pratigraharucir dvijaḥ / ambhasy āśmaplaveneva saha tenaiva majjati //
tasmād avidvān babhīyād yasmāt tasmāt pratigrahāt / svalpakenāpy avidvān hi pañke gaur iva sīdati //
na vāry api prayacchet tu baiḍālavratike dvivaje / na bakavratike pāpe nāvedavidī dharmavit //
triṣṭv apy eteṣu dattam hi vidhinā 'py arjitam dhanam / dātur bhavaty anarthāya paratrādātur eva ca //
yathā plavenaupalena nimajjaty uḍake taran / tathā nimajjato 'dhas tād aṅṇau dātṛpraticchakau //
dharmadhvajī sadālubdhaś chādmiko lokadambhakaḥ / baiḍālavratiko jñeyo hiṃsraḥ sarvābhisandhakaḥ //
adhodṛṣṭir naiṣṭṛikaḥ svārthasādhanaatparah / śaṭho mithyāvinītaś ca bakavratācaro dvijaḥ //
ye bakavratino viprā ye ca mārjāraliṅganaḥ / te patanty andhatāmisre tena pāpena karmaṇā //

The specification that the recipient falls into hell along with the donor is made explicit by Medhātithi in his commentary on the passage: *kena saha / anyasyānirdeśād dātus ca sannidhānāt tena dātṛ saheti gamyate / ... dātā hi brāhmaṇāya dadānaś ca tādrśo brāhmaṇa ubhāv api narakaṃ gacchataḥ /*. The same specification is found in the commentaries of Kullūka, Nandana and Govindarāja, while Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Rāghavānanda, Rāmacandra, and Maṇirāma clarify that the recipient and donor suffer together but do not explicitly mention hell. For the text of these passages I have referred to Dave 1975: 440-41. See also *Manusmṛti* 4.192, 195-97 = *Viṣṇusmṛti* 93.7-10 (edition Jolly 1881: 191, translation Jolly 1880: 275), and compare also *Vāsiṣṭha Dharmasāstra* 6.32 (translation Bühler 1882: 39), and *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 1.200-202.

into a morass. A man who knows the law should not offer even water to a hypocritical Brāhmaṇa, nor an evil and dishonest Brāhmaṇa, nor to one who is unacquainted with the Veda. For property, though earned in accordance with prescribed rules, which is given to these three persons, causes in the next world misery both to the giver and the recipient.

It is only to be expected that the qualifications which permit one to be considered a worthy recipient differ somewhat between the Brahmanical and Buddhist contexts (and they are indeed not entirely uniform even within the Brahmanical texts themselves). But the essential logic and the mode of expression are so close as to convince us that we are dealing here with the same basic ideology. One important difference worth noting, however, is the emphasis in Brahmanical literature not only on the qualifications of the recipient but also on the qualifications and purity of the *donor*.¹ If the brāhmaṇa recipient is not to pollute himself in accepting a gift, the purity of the donor is of paramount importance. No such qualifications enter into the Buddhist discussions.²

While this identity of attitude is common, this is not the only available opinion, in either Buddhist or Brahmanical literature. Some Buddhist texts seem to imply that merely by virtue of being a monk one is worthy, almost regardless of one's behavior, and

¹ In the formulation of Kane ii.847, it is, apparently, the view of the sage Devala that "It is not the extent of the gift that causes greater or lesser merit. Merit (*punya*) of gifts depends upon the mental attitude, the capacity of the giver and the way in which the donor acquired his wealth." Thus it is the qualifications of, above all, the *donor* which decide the merit which will evolve from the gift.

² We do however find certain stipulations, nearly identical with those found in Brahmanical texts, concerning which houses may be skipped by a monk making alms rounds in a systematic fashion. The texts allow that the monks may skip those houses which are ritually impure, and the examples given make it clear that the impurity envisioned in these discussions is the typically Brahmanical sort of ritual impurity caused by birth or the like.

One other possibly important difference which should be noted is that discussions of donations in the Brahmanical context are not limited to, and in fact not even primarily concerned with, donations of alms food. Donations of, most importantly, real property (land, villages, etc.) are commonly in question. The Buddhist materials, on the other hand, for the most part do not contemplate the donation of anything other than the basic requisites of the monk, mostly alms food and clothing, with medicines and dwellings also part of the set (of "*niśrayas*") but less important. In other contexts, donations of land and so forth may occur when the recipient is a monastery or corporate body, but not an individual monk. (There may, I suspect, be exceptions to this, but they would probably have to be treated as just that — exceptions.)

this view may also imply — although it certainly does not state so explicitly — that one is worthy to receive gifts.¹ In a discussion of offerings (*dakkhiṇā*), for example, the *Majjhima Nikāya* says this:²

In the distant future, Ānanda, there will be those who are *gotrabhū*,³ with the ochre robes around their necks, but precept breakers, of evil behavior, and [donors] will give gifts directed to the community to those precept breakers. Even then, Ānanda, I say that offerings to the community are incalculable, unlimited. But I do not say, Ānanda, that in any way gifts to specific individuals bear greater fruit than offerings to the community [as a whole].

In the same fashion, some (albeit late and hardly mainstream) Brahmanical texts state that no matter what condition a brāhmaṇa is in, whether of good or bad conduct, vulgar or an intellectual, he is still a “great deity (*daivataṁ mahat*)” worthy of gifts.⁴ This view, however, seems to be very much a minority opinion in both traditions.

The question of how the merit which accrues to a donor may be affected by the suitability of the recipient of his gift seems to me an interesting one. That is, while it is relatively easy to understand how the unworthiness of the donor might somehow negatively affect the gift and make it unacceptable to the recipient, since the donor actually touches the gift before giving it — an unworthy donor being unable to infuse some power

¹ I have in mind for example a passage from the *Kṣitigarbhasūtra*, quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 68.2-4: “But even though [the wicked monk] is unworthy, yet still by his shaven scalp and face, by his deportment in [wearing] the ochre robes and upper garments, although it is only for show, he is one who provides the opportunity for many beings to generate various kinds of roots of good, he is one who shows the way to good destinies.” *kiṃ cāpi sa apātrībhūtaḥ tena ca punaḥ śīrastuṇḍamuṇḍena kāśāyavastraprāvaraṇeryāpathena darśanahetunāpi bahūnāṁ satvānāṁ vividhakuśalamūlopastambhanakaraḥ sugati-mārgadarśako bhavati* /.

² MN iii.256,6-12: *bhavissanti kho pan' ānanda anāgataṁ addhānaṁ gotrabhuno kāsāvakaṇṭhā dussilā pāpadhammā tesu dussilesu saṅghaṁ uddissa dānaṁ dassanti. tadā p' ahaṁ ānanda saṅgha-gataṁ dakkhiṇaṁ asaṅkheyyaṁ appameyyaṁ vadāmi na tv evāhaṁ ānanda kenaci pariyāyena saṅgha-gatāya dakkhiṇāya pāṭipuggalikaṁ dānaṁ mahapphalataraṁ vadāmi*. The passage appears to be missing in the corresponding Chinese versions: *Madhyama Āgama* T. 26 (180) (I) 722bc, and T. 84 (I) 904ab.

³ On this term, see Ruegg 1974. According to Ruegg 1974: 200, this negative reference to *gotrabhū*, which seems elsewhere to be a positive designation, is an isolated case in the Pāli canon.

⁴ Kane ii.117, with note 252, quoting a Vṛddha-Gautama *smṛti*, on which see Kane i.38.

into the gift, for example, thus failing to render it auspicious — the reverse is much more difficult to understand. Once the gift has left the donor's hands, how can its subsequent fate have any connection with the donor? Does the donor in some sense retain an interest in the gift after it is given? If so, this would have to make us reconsider what sort of "alienation" we imagine to be taking place in the giving of a gift.¹ On the other hand, this approach may be leading us in the wrong direction. I believe that from a sociological point of view, or even we might say a political point of view, the question takes on a new meaning. There is a motivation built into the system to encourage potential receivers of gifts to toe some sort of behavioral or ideological line, and this motivation is the threat that if they fail to do so, they will not only not benefit themselves by accepting such gifts, but will also bring harm to the donors whose gifts they receive. Therefore, if this is thought to be so, naturally the gifts will cease to be given by donors who fear they will not profit thereby, or will even bring harm upon themselves by giving to an unworthy recipient.²

The direct connection between the reputation of the recipient and his income is

¹ I think we can define the term "alienation" as the lawyers do. *Webster's New International Dictionary* defines "alienation" as "a legal conveyance of property to another," and s.v. alienate, has the following:

To convey or transfer to another, as title, property, or right; ... In its widest sense property is *alienated* when the title is transferred from one person to another in any way; but generally the sense of alienating is restricted to the transfer of the title to property by the act of the owner, as distinguished from a transfer effected entirely by operation of law Strictly, an alienation involves a complete transfer of the title to property, and a mortgage or any other encumbrance or disposition falling short of that does not constitute an alienation.

Black's Law Dictionary (Black 1968) s.v. alienation has a similar definition. I do not, therefore, use the term with any Marxian intent.

Luis Gómez has offered me the objection that both directions of movement partake equally in what he calls "magical thinking." Certainly he is right that the entire process works only "magically," but (without getting into a whole critique of the concept of magic), I think we can also admit that some "magical" moves are more understandable than others. It would take us far off the track to discuss this issue here, but it is good to note it.

² Note that this concept of reciprocity does not fully accord with the view related by Strenski 1983: 473, that the saṅgha as the recipient of gifts is not the origin of merit but only its occasion.

stated in the *Soṇadaṇḍa-sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*. The brāhmaṇa Soṇadaṇḍa worries that if, in his meeting with the Buddha, he is shown up to be ignorant then his reputation, and consequently his income, will suffer:¹ “If, then, this assembly were to regard one with contempt, his reputation would be lost, and the wealth would also be lost of one whose reputation would be lost; our wealth is due to our reputation.” This suggestion sidesteps the question, which is perhaps a metaphysical one, of the connection between the already alienated gift and the giver of that gift, and prefers to look for a historical justification for the doctrine. In this regard, I think there can be little doubt that the origins of this system of thought are to be found in the ideology of the Vedic sacrifice.

The offerings to gods in sacrifice are effective primarily if the sacrifice is done correctly and, with the possible exception of the earliest periods, in the Vedic tradition if the sacrifice is carried out correctly the results are automatic and necessary. The sacrificer (= donor) makes his offering, and as an automatic result of this gains merit.² In the context of the *R̥gveda*, Vijay Nath refers to what may be viewed as a rather undeveloped or unelaborated form of the reciprocal nature of alms giving and resultant merit, quoting:³ “Bounteous is he who gives unto the beggar who comes to him in want of food

¹ DN i.118,2-2-4: *yaṃ kho paṇāyaṃ parisā paribhaveyya yaso pi tassa hāyetha / yassa kho pana yaso hāyetha bhogā pi tassa hāyeyuṃ / yasoladdhā kho pana' amhākaṃ bhogā*. The parallel passage in *Dīrghāgama* T. 1 (22) (I) 95c10-17 is phrased in a slightly different way, although the intent is the same.

² For a brief discussion of this point concerning the historical antecedents of the ideology of the gift I am indebted to Prof. Madhav Deshpande.

There are complicated questions concerning the range of meaning of the crucial term translated here as “merit,” *puṇya*, and there is no doubt an important evolution in meaning, itself perhaps not unrelated to the issue we are discussing. We are fortunate in this regard, however, in being able to refer to the detailed discussion of Filliozat 1980 concerning the semantic field of the term *puṇya*, and the availability of his study frees us from having to investigate that issue further here. Filliozat has shown that different contexts may require different meanings ranging from good, good fortune, agreeable, advantageous, favorable, through moral, benefit, good luck, well being and the like. It is difficult to summarize Filliozat’s tightly written paper, which is now conveniently available in English.

³ Nath 1987: 15, and note 5, referring to *R̥gveda* X.117.3. Maurer 1986: 302 has rendered: “Bountiful indeed is he who gives to a beggar, to one desiring food, to the weak man wandering about. Enough it is for him to be called on in time of need. Also for future days he makes a friend.” Doniger 1981: 68-69 has: “The man who is truly generous gives to the beggar who approaches him thin and in

and feeble. Success attends him in the shout of battle. He makes a friend of him in future troubles.” P. V. Kane refers to a nearby passage in which the rewards for gifts of *dakṣiṇā* are stated — that is, there will result a sort of automatic recompense for the gift.¹ These references are both from the tenth *maṇḍala* of the *R̥gveda*, the latest component of that scripture. Somewhat later still, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* is representative of the transitional phase between late Vedic and early Brahmanical literature. It contains the following passage:²

Verily, there are two kinds of gods; for, indeed, the gods are the gods; and the Brāhmins who have studied and teach the sacred lore are the human gods. The sacrifice of these is divided into two kinds: oblations constitute the sacrifice to the gods; and gifts to the priests that to the human gods, the Brāhmins who have studied and teach the sacred lore. With oblations one gratifies the gods, and with gifts to the priests, the human gods, the Brāhmins who have studied and teach the sacred lore. Both these kinds of gods, when gratified, place him in a state of bliss [or: they convey him to the celestial world].

A little bit later still, we find in the *Sāṅkhyāyana Gr̥hyasūtra* the expression:³ “Whoever distributes food to a Brāhmaṇa who performs the sacred rites will never go hungry.” This Vedic notion and its elaboration in the Brāhmaṇas, then, seems to represent an early stage in the evolution of the notion that the act of giving has a direct and automatic result for the donor, and suggests the origins of the idea that the suitability

search of food. He puts himself at the service of the man who calls to him from the road, and makes him a friend for times to come.”

¹ Kane ii.838-39 referring to *R̥gveda* X.107. See also Gonda 1965: 213, who remarks that in the *R̥gveda* and *Atharvaveda* the objects gifted to a poet produce for the donor benefit and prosperity.

² *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 2.2.2.6 = 4.3.3.4 (Weber 1855): *dvayā vai devā devāḥ / ahaiva devā atha ye brāhmaṇāḥ śuśruvāmso 'nucānās te manuṣyadevās teṣāṃ dvedhāvibhakta eva yajña āhutaya eva devānām dakṣiṇā manuṣyadevānām brāhmaṇānām śuśruvuṣām anucānānam āhutibhir eva devān prīṇāti dakṣiṇā-bhir manuṣyadevān brāhmaṇāṇ chūśruvuṣo 'nucānāms ta 'enam ubhaye devāḥ prītāḥ sudhāyām dadhati* [or: *svargaṃ lokam abhivanantī*]. Translation from Eggeling 1882: 309-10. See Kane ii.840, and also Gonda 1965: 215.

³ *Sāṅkhyāyana Gr̥hyasūtra* I.2.2-6, translated in Oldenberg 1886: 15-16.

of the recipient dictates the merit to be obtained by that donor. The development and expansion of this notion comes later.

The Dharma or so-called legal literature provides clear examples of the extension of the concept. It has been suggested that in some sense alms begging is regarded as equivalent to a sacrifice. According to Kaebler, the *Āpastambha Dharmasūtra* “states that alms are equivalent to sacrificial food. The teacher who receives the alms from the student holds the place which the deity holds at the conventional sacrifice. The teacher also holds the place of the Āhavanīya fire at the sacrifice because a portion of the alms is offered in the fire of his stomach.”¹ A formulation with a similar implication is found in the *Manusmṛti*:² “Truly, an uneducated priest has been extinguished like a grass fire; no one should give him offerings to the gods, since one should not make an offering into dead ashes.” The *Manusmṛti* again states: “One should give, according to one’s ability, wealth to Brāhmaṇas learned in the Veda and living alone; thus one obtains after death heavenly bliss.”³ Similar ideas are also found in other texts. Both the *Manusmṛti* and the *Viṣṇusmṛti* state that gifts result in fruits in the world to come, ranging from those equivalent to the value of the gift, if given to non-brāhmaṇas, up to those which are infinite, produced by gifts to those who have mastered the whole Veda.⁴ An identical formulation is given in the *Gautama Dharmasūtra*,⁵ and only slightly different is the

¹ Kaebler 1981: 86: He refers to *Āpastambha* 1.1.3.43-44.

² *Manusmṛti* 3.168, translated in Doniger and Smith 1991.

³ *Manusmṛti* 11.6: *dhāni tu yathāśakti vipreṣu pratipādayet / vedavitsū vivikṭeṣu pretya svargaṃ samaśnute* //. I have followed the English translation in Bühler 1886: 431. Doniger and Smith 1991: 251, note to verse 6, state that the verse “is almost certainly an interpolation.” I do not know, however, how new or old that would make it. Compare *Vāsiṣṭha Dharmśāstra* 3.8-9, with an English translation in Bühler 1882: 17-18.

⁴ *Manusmṛti* 7.85: *samam abrahmaṇe dānam dviguṇam brāhmaṇa bruve / ācārye śatasāhasram anantaṃ vedapārāge* //. *Viṣṇusmṛti* 93.1-4 (edition Jolly 1881:191, translation Jolly 1880: 274-75): *abrahmaṇe dattaṃ tatsamam eva pārālukikam / dviguṇam brāhmaṇabruve / sahasraguṇam prādhūte / anantaṃ vedapārāge* /.

⁵ *Gautama Dharmasūtra* 5.20 (translation Bühler 1879: 201; 5.21 in the edition of Mitra 1969: 93): *sama dvigūna sahasrā nantāni phalāny abrahmaṇa brāhmaṇa śrotṛiya vedapārāgebhyah* /.

version in the *Agni Purāṇa*.¹ The latter tradition continues this interpretation, and the commentator on *Manusmṛti* Medhātithi (9th c.) refers to the unseen (*adr̥ṣṭa*) result which the receiver believes will accrue to the giver from an act of giving.²

Jan Gonda, one of the most prolific writers on Indian religion, has considered the topic of gifts in some detail.³ He remarks on the existence of the idea that a gift sent but never received does not produce unseen merit, and comments: "This conviction is in perfect harmony with the belief in the automatic appearance of symptoms or results of sinful or meritorious deeds, the facts, deeds, committal or omission as such leading to definite effects, whatever the intention or grade of consciousness of the person who acts, commits an incorrect deed or is in default."⁴ What is most interesting for us about this comment, perhaps, is that seen in the light of Buddhist views it is precisely the intention and inner mental state of the actor which determine the degree of (karmic) responsibility in which the action will result. This seems to be diametrically opposed to the reasoning suggested by Gonda.

Gonda has also referred to the sort of evolution we have been discussing. He remarks on an older Vedic tradition in which the recipients are pure brahmans who have studied the Vedas, and contrasts this Vedic tradition, characterized according to him by

¹ *Agni Purāṇa* 209.34-36ab (Upādhyāya 1966: 303): *varṇasaṅkare dviguṇam śūdre dānam caturguṇam / vaiśye cāṣṭaguṇam kṣatre ṣoḍaśatvaṁ dvijavrate // vedādhyāye śataguṇam anantaṁ vedabodhake / purohite yājakādaḥ [v.l. yācakādaḥ] dānam akṣayam ucyate // śrīvihīneṣu yad dattaṁ tad anantaṁ ca yajvani /* "To one of mixed caste (a gift) has merit two times (that of the gift itself). A gift to a Śūdra four times the merit. To a Vaiśya eight times the merit. To a Kṣatriya sixteen times, and to a Brahmin who is learned in the Veda one hundred times the merit. To one who is a teacher of the Veda, it is endless. It is said that a gift to a priest, a sacrificing priest [v.l. beggar] and the like is inextinguishable. That gift given to those without wealth and to the performer of sacrifices is endless."

² Quoted by Kane ii.842. (Also quoted from Kane, without attribution, by Gonda 1965: 210.) Medhātithi is commenting on Manu 4.5, giving a definition of what constitutes *pratigraha*, "acceptance of the gift." The passage is found in Dave 1975: 284: *adr̥ṣṭabuddhyā dīyamānaḥ mantrapūrvam gr̥hṇataḥ pratigraho bhavati*. On the date of Medhātithi, see Kane i.583.

³ Gonda 1965: 198-228.

⁴ Gonda 1965: 221.

the *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*, with the more detailed discussions in the later Purāṇas, noting a “tendency to extend and develop ancient customs and traditional practices while clinging to what was thought to be essential.”¹ The characterizations found in the Purāṇic literature are discussed by R. C. Hazra as follows:²

The characteristics of those Brāhmins who are the worthy recipients of gifts are laid down in the Purāṇic chapters on gifts. These characteristics are important in that they point not only to the economic condition of the priestly Brāhmins but also to the causes which compelled them to be hunters of gifts. The Purāṇas say that the recipients of gifts should be ‘śrotriya’ (versed in Śruti), ‘kulīna’ (of high lineage), ‘vinīta’ (well disciplined), ‘vratastha’ (observing a vow), ‘tapasvin’ (practising penance), ‘sāgnika’ or ‘āhitāgni’ (maintaining the sacred fire in the house, i.e., performing sacrifices), ‘veda-pāraga’ (master of the Vedas), ‘sadācāra’ (of good conduct), ‘annārthin’ (wanting food), ‘kuṭumbin’ (burdened with families), ‘daridra’ (poor), and so forth.

In the *Agni Purāṇa*, for instance, Chapters 208-213 are devoted to the topic of gifts. There we find the following:³ “(I make a gift) to such and such a Brāhmaṇa belonging to such and such a lineage, who is devoted to the Vedas and the related sciences, who is a worthy recipient and is extremely illustrious.”

Finally, we may note that it is not surprising to find that the Epic tradition contains precisely the same sorts of formulations. We notice just a couple of examples

¹ Gonda 1965: 223 and 226. For the *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra* he refers to 2.6.15.12ff, for which see Bühler 1879: 137: “At all religious ceremonies, he shall feed Brāhmaṇas who are pure and who have (studied and remember) the Veda. ... etc.” (Verses 11ff. in Pāṇḍeya 1969: 309.) Gonda refers also to *Vāsiṣṭha* 3.8 and 6.30, for which see Bühler 1882: 17-18 and 39: “Offerings to the gods and to the manes must always be given to the Śrotriya alone. For gifts bestowed on a man unacquainted with the Veda, reach neither the ancestors nor the gods.” And: “They declare that he is worthy to receive gifts, who (daily) rise to recite the Veda, who is of good family, and perfectly free from passion, who constantly offers sacrifices in the three sacred fires, who fears sin, and knows much, who is beloved among the females (of his family), who is righteous, protects cows, and reduces himself by austerities.” Gonda also points to *Manusmṛti* 3.98, 3.128, 3.132, and 4.31.

² Hazra 1940: 253, and note 36 which refers to various Purāṇic sources for this formulation.

³ *Agni Purāṇa* 209.58 (Upādhyāya 1966: 303): *tathā cāmukagoṭrāya tathā cāmukaśarmmaṇe / vedavedāṅgayuktāya pātrāya sumahātmane //*. (See Nath 1987: 203).

from the *Mahābhārata*: “As fire spread with green wood does not burn, just so is the receiver [of gifts] deficient in austerities, study of the Vedas, and observance of duties.”¹ “Not to one who is wicked, nor to one of bad family, nor who is not perfect in his vows [should a gift be given]; the gift given to a brāhmaṇa not versed in the Vedas is dead, and he is called a non-brāhmaṇa.”²

Now that we have seen what constitutes the Brahmanical “background,” we have some context in which to turn to an examination of the Buddhist materials themselves. Before we enter into that examination, however, let us briefly refer to the idea of the historian Romila Thapar, who has suggested that the concept of an exchange of *dāna* for merit (*punya*) may actually be traced to Buddhist inspiration.³

All that the *bhikṣu* or the *saṅgha* could provide to the donor in exchange for *dāna* was *punya* or merit, since exchange was between economically unequal section of society. In the early stages, when Buddhism was not a powerful religious movement, it could neither provide social status to its lay supporters nor did its doctrinal teaching promise immortality or heavenly abodes. At most it could maintain that a material gift would be reciprocated with preaching the Buddhist ethic which in turn might provide the gift of vision or enlightenment to the donors.... The reciprocity of *dāna* with *punya* may also have been conditioned by the fact that in the larger towns, where there was a Buddhist following, the gift-exchange economy was on the decline and was being gradually replaced by an approximation to the impersonal market economy of commerce, where the unit of money was the currency of exchange. In such an ethos gift-exchange made little sense

¹ Śāntiparvan 12.37.34: *kāṣṭhāir ārdrair yathā vahnir upastīrṇo na dīpyate / tapaḥsvādhyāyacāritrair evaṃ hīnaḥ pratigrahit* //. See Nath 1987: 92.

² Śāntiparvan 12.37.31: *na durjane dauṣkule vā vratair vā yo na saṃskṛtaḥ / aśrotṛiye mṛtaṃ dānam brāhmaṇe 'brāhmavādini* //.

³ Thapar 1976: 116-17. Aside from my general disagreement with Thapar's conclusions, it is worth noting in passing that she seems to have overlooked some basics of Buddhist doctrine. Whether or not Buddhism could provide social status to its supporters (and I am willing to follow Thapar here in guessing that it could not), it is mistaken to claim that it did not offer immortality or heavenly abodes. This it most certainly did offer. Any connection between such a doctrine, however, and more concrete exchanges of tangible goods within an actual economy strikes me as a clear instance of a category mistake.

and the *dāna-puṇya* reciprocity held out some compensation for the donor.

We have already seen in the materials presented above, however, that it might be very difficult to uphold this view, and in fact Thapar's idea that a connection between *dāna* and *puṇya* is a later innovation has already been rejected by Vijay Nath, who observed in response to Thapar that "actually the genesis of the concept of spiritual merit arising out of religious and charitable gifts can be traced to the later Vedic period when it already existed in the form of *iṣṭapūrta*."¹

Despite this rejection of Thapar's suggestions of a Buddhist origin for the notion of an "exchange" between charity and merit, it is certainly true that the idea pervades Buddhist ideology. And the emphasis, when it is not on the "fantastic opportunity" available to potential donors to make merit virtually without effort by mere charity (as opposed to strenuous spiritual practice), is squarely on the essential requirement that the recipient make himself worthy of receiving a donation. The *Saṃyutta Nikāya* says:² "What is given to one who upholds the precepts, great king, produces great results, not what is given to one who violates the precepts." This is expanded in the same passage as follows:³

Just so [as with the case of the example just given] is it with one, no matter what family he be from, who has renounced the household life for the

¹ Nath 1987: 204. In this regard Nath refers specifically to *Rgveda* X.148. I have not discussed *iṣṭapūrta* here, and I am not qualified to enter into discussions of Vedic materials, but the reader may refer to Kane ii.843-45 for a short discussion. One might also note, as Kane points out, *Manusmṛti* 4. 226-27.

² SN i.98,27-28 (III.3 §4,5): *sīlavato kho mahārāja dinnam mahapphalaṃ no tathā dussīle*.

³ SN i.99,22-100,6 (III.3 §4,13-16): *evam eva kho mahārāja yasmā kasmā ce pi kulā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajito hoti / sa ca hoti pañcaṅgavippahīno pañcaṅgasamannāgato / tasmim dinnam mahapphalaṃ // katamāni pañca aṅgāni pahīnāni honti / kāmaccando pahīno hoti / vyāpādo pahīno hoti / thīnamiddham pahīno hoti / uddhaccakukkuccam pahīno hoti / vicikicchā pahīno hoti / imāni pañcaṅgāni pahīno hoti // katamehi pañca aṅgehi samannāgato hoti / asekkhena silakkhandhena samannāgato hoti / asekkhena samādhikkhandhena samannāgato hoti / asekkhena paññakkhandhena samannāgato hoti / asekkhena vimuttikkhandhena samannāgato hoti / asekkhena vimuttiññānadassanakkhandhena samannāgato hoti / imehi pañca aṅgehi samannāgato hoti // iti pañcaṅgavippahīne pañcaṅgasamannāgate dinnam mahapphalaṃ ti //*. See AN i.161,28-162,10 (III.57.1) for a formulation exactly the same as that in this and the preceding note.

homeless life. He has abandoned five qualities and is endowed with five qualities. What is given to him yields great fruits. What are the five qualities which he has abandoned? He has abandoned desire for sensual pleasure.¹ He has abandoned malice. He has abandoned sloth and torpor. He has abandoned haughtiness and remorse. He has abandoned doubt. These five qualities are abandoned. What are the five qualities with which he is endowed? He is endowed with the constituent elements of morality of one who has nothing more to learn. He is endowed with the constituent elements of concentration of one who has nothing more to learn. He is endowed with the constituent elements of wisdom of one who has nothing more to learn. He is endowed with the constituent elements of liberation of one who has nothing more to learn. He is endowed with the constituent elements of wisdom and vision of liberation of one who has nothing more to learn. These are the five qualities with which he is endowed. When one has thus abandoned five qualities and is endowed with five [other] qualities what is given to him yields great fruits.

In the *Āṅguttara Nikāya*, gifts given to śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas endowed with eight qualities are said to produce great fruits. The eight qualities refer to the eight-fold path, right views etc.²

Let us return now to the *Ratnarāśi* and its discussion of the group of five hundred monks who feel themselves unworthy to receive alms from pious donors. Those monks voluntarily leave the Buddha's assembly. This type of episode, in which because of their feelings of possessing inadequate virtues monks retire from the assembly, is, in fact, a rather common one in Buddhist literature. A characteristic example is found in a text we have already seen to be closely related to the *Ratnarāśi*, namely the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. After the Buddha preaches a series of verses, many of the audience attain different levels of spiritual awakening. However:

¹ I have understood the term, following the Tibetan translation in Mhy. 2218, as a *tatpuruṣa*, 'dod pa la 'dun pa. See also BHSD s.v. kāmaccanda, translated as "desire for lusts."

² AN iv.238,4-13.

Five hundred monks, possessors of the meditative trances, rising from their seats departed, not comprehending, not penetrating, not being firmly convinced of this profound teaching of the doctrine.¹

Then the Reverend Mahākāśyapa said this to the Blessed One: “These five hundred monks, Blessed One, possessors of the meditative trances, rising from their seats departed, not comprehending, not penetrating, not being firmly convinced of this profound teaching of the doctrine.”

The Blessed One said: “Just so, Kāśyapa. These monks are conceited. Not being firmly convinced of it, hearing this full accomplishment of profound verses which is the teaching, free from depravity, about the purity of the precepts, they do not comprehend it, are not firmly convinced of it, and do not penetrate it. Why? Kāśyapa, beings who have not planted the roots of good, who surround themselves with evil friends, who do not abound in firm conviction are not capable of being firmly convinced of, or of fully obtaining, or of comprehending this profound awakening of the buddhas, blessed ones which is fully accomplished in these profound verses.²

“Indeed, Kāśyapa, these five hundred monks were followers of non-buddhist movements in the time of the preaching of the Tathāgata, Arhat, Perfect and Complete Buddha Kāśyapa. They listened to an exposition of the doctrine given by the Tathāgata Kāśyapa with hostile intent. But listening to it, they attained a single thought of faith, and considered: “It is wondrous how sweet and pretty a speaker indeed is the Tathāgata, Arhat, Perfect and Complete Buddha Kāśyapa!” When they died from that [existence] they died with a single thought of faith, and were re-born among the gods of the thirty-three. And for just that reason they renounced the world here in this life in my instruction.

¹ §138: *pañca bhikṣuśatāni dhyānalābhī utthāyāsanebhyaḥ prakrāntāni imāṃ gambhīrā dharmadeśanām [nā]vatarānto nāvagāhamānāḥ anadhimucyamānāḥ.*

² §139: *athāyusmān mahākāśyapo bhagavaṃtam etad avocat, imāni bhagavaṃ pañca bhikṣuśatāni dhyānalābhīny utthāyāsanebhyaḥ prakrāntāni / imā gambhīrā dharmadeśanām [nā]vatarānto nāvagāhamānto m-anadhimucyamānāḥ bhagavān āha / tathā hy ete kāśyapa bhikṣavaḥ adhimānikā te m-anadhimucyamānā imāṃ gambhīrā gāthābhinirhārām anāsravaṃ śīlaviśuddhinirdeśaṃ śrutvā nāvatarānti nādhimucyānti nāvagāhamānti tat kasmād dheto gambhīro yaṃ kāśyapa gāthābhinirhārām gambhīraṃ buddhānā bhagavaṃtānām bodhi sā na śakyam anavaropitakuśalamūle pāpamitraparigrhīter anadhimuktibahule satvair adhimucyitum vā paryāpunitum vā avataritum vā /*

“These five hundred monks, Kāśyapa, sunken into the items of wrong speculation, do not comprehend, do not penetrate, are not firmly convinced of, do not have faith in this profound teaching of the doctrine. But now that they have cultivated themselves though this teaching of the doctrine, they will not further experience evil destinies, but will attain nirvāṇa in this very life.”¹

In the sequel to this passage (§§141-149), however, the Buddha sends two magically manifested monks to chase after these problem monks and bring them to an understanding of the teaching. The two magic manifestations engage in a philosophically abstract dialogue with the five hundred monks, after which the latter return and again engage in a similarly abstract dialogue with Subhūti.² While it may be too much to suggest that the authors of the *Ratnarāśi* necessarily knew this episode in the *Kāśyapa-parivarta*, and modeled their own composition upon it, it is clear, I think, that the two episodes are similar in type. What the authors of the *Ratnarāśi* have done with their text, however, is different than what the authors of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* have accomplished. Whereas in the latter the emphasis is on doctrinal or philosophical understanding, with a sort of side recognition of the effects of karmic conditioning, the *Ratnarāśi* has used the episode to drive home a point about proper monastic behavior, this time in the context of the merit and demerit which arise from the process of giving and accepting alms. This use of an archetypal or formulaic passage in an innovative way is in some ways typical of

¹ §140: *api ca kāśyapa etāni pañca bhikṣuśatāni kāśyapasya tathāgatasyārghata samyak sambuddhasya pravacane anyatīrthikaśrāvakā abhūvan, s-te kāśyapasya tathāgatasyāmīkād uparambhābhiprāyair ekā dharmadeśanā śrūtā śrūtvā ce[k]acittaprasādo labdha āścāryam yāvan madhurapriyabhāṇī khalv eyam kāśyapa tathāgato rhām samyak sambuddha iti / te tataś cyuta samānā ekacittaprasādena kālagatāḥ trāyastriṃśeṣu deveṣūpapannāḥ teneva hetunā iha maṃma śāsane pravrajitāḥ tāny etāni kāśyapa pañca bhikṣuśatāni dṛṣṭigatapraskanditāni imāṃ gambhīrā dharmadeśanā nāvataranti nāvagāhanti nādhimucyante na śraddhadhaṃti / kṛtām punar eṣām ayaṃ dharmadeśanāyā parikarma na bhūyo vinipātāgāmino bhaviṣya[m]ti / ebhir eva skandhaiḥ parinirvāsyanti //*

² It is likely, as Nagao 1973: 19 and 21 has suggested, that this episode is in fact adventitious, since it is out of place with the rest of the sūtra. (It is only in this section, for example, that Subhūti appears.) It does appear already in the Han translation, however, and so is certainly very old.

the rhetorical strategy of the authors of the *Ratnarāṣi*. There are numerous places, as I have pointed out through these studies, in which an older cliché or stock expression is taken up and placed into a context different from that it originally or earlier occupied, in the process being given a new meaning.

The *Maitreya-Mahāsimhanāda* provides us with another example of a passage remarkably close to that in the *Ratnarāṣi*:¹

When the bodhisattva mahāsattva Maitreya had preached this Lion's Roar sermon, five hundred monks in that assembly got up from their sitting mats and left. Then the Elder Mahākāśyapa spoke as follows to those five hundred monks: "Great śramaṇas. Where are you going, getting up from your seats when a sermon on austerity is being preached?"

And when he had said this, those five hundred monks spoke to the Reverend Mahākāśyapa as follows: "Venerable Mahākāśyapa. Such things as were preached about by the bodhisattva mahāsattva Maitreya in the sermon on austerity are scarcely possible to attain. Therefore we think that since those virtues of the austerities do not appear in us it is certain that we should return to the householders state. And why? Because we think that the gift of faith is difficult to obtain, difficult to purify."

Then Mañjuśrī Kumārabhūta congratulated those monks, saying: "Good, gentle sons, good! Those who do not delight in the enjoyment of that gift of faith should therefore feel shame and remorse; it would be preferable that they give up their renunciation of the world one hundred times in a single day than for those who do not purify the precepts to enjoy the gift of faith."

Then Mañjuśrī Kumārabhūta spoke as follows to the Blessed One: "Blessed One. In what manner do you permit the gift of faith?"

The Blessed One said: "Mañjuśrī. I permit the gift of faith to those who are intent (*yukta*) and to those who are liberated (*mukta*)."

Then Mañjuśrī Kumārabhūta spoke as follows to those five hundred monks: "Reverends. You must strive, you must persevere, you must apply yourselves. The arising of a buddha is difficult to encounter, so you must not

¹ See the Textual Sources for the text translated here.

retreat from your renunciation of the world.”

Then those five hundred monks spoke as follows to Mañjuśrī Kumārabhūta: “Mañjuśrī. How should we strive?”

Mañjuśrī said: “Monks. You must strive, apply yourselves, persevere such that no dharma¹ is joined together, no dharma is split apart, no dharma is produced, no dharma is destroyed, no dharma is obtained, no dharma is lost, no dharma is decreased, no dharma is increased. The monk who strives in this fashion will not mistakenly cognize² any dharma. One who does not mistakenly cognize any dharma does not go anywhere. He does not come from anywhere. For one who has no going there is also no coming. He is called a monk without coming or going. Neither does he rest anywhere, nor not rest anywhere.”

When he had preached this teaching, the minds of those five hundred monks, free from clinging, became liberated from the depravities.

We can see that this presentation of the formulaic pattern has more in common with the *Kāśyapaparivarta* than it does with the *Ratnarāśi*, the emphasis again being not on practical matters of monastic deportment or behavior so much as proper philosophical understanding. Yet another episode very similar to that in the *Ratnarāśi* is found in another Mahāyāna sūtra, the *Weicengyou yinyuan jing* 未曾有因緣經, and concerns five hundred monks of wicked behavior:³

There were five hundred monks of wicked (**daṣṭhūlya*) behavior, and having listened to the Buddha's sermon they got up and paid obeisance, bowing their heads to the Buddha and saying: “Blessed One. We are not able to practice the path of renunciation. Why? From long ago we have practiced in a defiled way for the sake of material gains., we are vain and dishonest. Our debt is increasing, and we are truly repentant. Now we want to leave the monkhood and return to lay life. We beg the Buddha to grant his approval.”

¹ Here = “constituent element,” rather than merely “thing”?

² **vi*kalp.

³ T. 754 (XVII) 584b23-c4.

The Buddha said to those monks: “Good! Good! I am happy to help you. Why? A person may enter a course of activity, such as grasping a sword or taking a poison, but be unable to bear it, and then he is better off not to do it. Why? Because grasping them is not pleasant,¹ but on the contrary is damaging. You now have faith in [the reality of the law of] the results of actions, and feel shame and modesty. Because of this shame and modesty you are finished with sinning and increase your roots of good. At the time in the future when Maitreya will become a buddha, you shall be able to attain nirvāṇa as members of his first assembly.”

The last element in this passage, the confession of one’s transgressions, seems to be of crucial importance, especially with regard to the prediction of rebirth in the time of Maitreya. The aspiration to be among the members of the first assembly of Maitreya also seems to be a stereotype.² We will return to this very important pericope, found of course also in the *Ratnarāṣi*, below. But before we do, let us note that there are canonical antecedents to this type of pattern for which we have just quoted several Mahāyāna examples.

Let us look first to the *Āṅguttara Nikāya*.³ There we find a *sutta* which contrasts seven sets of opposite possibilities, one seemingly painful the other pleasant. The Buddha informs the monks that the apparently pleasant options are in fact the more dangerous, and to be rejected. Four of the sets deal with unworthy recipients accepting donations, the gift of faith (*saddhādeyya*).⁴ The fifth item, for example, specifically deals with alms, and reads as follows:⁵

¹ Correcting 勤 into 勸.

² In the *Mahāvamsa* XXXII.81 (Geiger 1912: 227), the Ceylonese king Duṭṭhagāmaṇi “will be the first disciple of the sublime Metteya.”

³ AN iv.128,1-135,8 (*Aggi-sutta*: Sattaka-nipāta, Mahāvagga 68). Chinese parallels are in T. 26 (5) (I) 427a4ff. = T. 125 (33.10) (II) 689c2ff. = T. 1248 (XXII) 1011b3ff. — the entire *sutta* is contained here at the end of the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya!

⁴ The successive gifts of faith are the robes, alms, couch and chair, and dwelling place.

⁵ AN iv.131,23-132,28.

“What do you think, monks. Which is better? That a strong man having opened one’s mouth with a heated iron stake, burning, set afire, aflame, should thrust into one’s mouth a heated metal ball, burning ... which would burn his lips, and mouth, and tongue, and throat, and stomach, and intestines and lower intestines, and would pass out the anus, or that one should enjoy alms as a gift of faith from the house of a great kṣatriya, or from the house of a great brahman, or from the house of a great householder?”

“This indeed is better, Reverend, that one should enjoy alms as a gift of faith from a great kṣatriya family, or a great brāhmaṇa family, or a great householder family. For it would be painful, Reverend, that a strong man having opened one’s mouth ... and would pass out the anus.”

“I declare to you, monks, I announce to you monks, that it would be better for a precept breaker, of evil behavior, impure, of vile conduct, who acts secretly, who while not a śramaṇa claims to be a śramaṇa, who while not a keeper of the practice of purity claims to be a keeper of the practice of purity, who is internally putrid, internally leaking, internally of a rotten nature, that a strong man having opened one’s mouth ... and would pass out the anus. Why? Since on that account, monks, one might suffer death, or suffering close to that of death, but as a result of that one will never after the breaking up of the body and after death be reborn in an evil state, an evil destiny, a state of punishment, hell. But for the precept breaker, of evil behavior ... who enjoys alms as a gift of faith from the house of a great kṣatriya ... — for him, monks, there is suffering and harm through the long night of saṃsāra, and after the breaking up of the body and after death he is reborn in an evil state, an evil destiny, a state of punishment, hell.”

Receiving gifts while upholding the proper attitude and behavior, on the other hand, rewards the giver of the gift and the receiver likewise. Again the *Anguttara Nikāya*:¹

“For those from whom we enjoy the requisites, robes, alms, sitting mats and beds, and medicaments, that action [of accepting their donation] will produce great fruit, great benefit. And for us monks as well, this

¹ AN iv.134,25-135,8.

renunciation of the world will be not barren, but fruitful and profitable.”

“You must train yourselves thus: Monks, one keeping in view his own benefit is well able to strive without carelessness. And one keeping in view the benefit of others is well able to strive without carelessness. And one keeping both in view is well able to strive without carelessness.”

Thus spoke the Buddha. And while this sermon was being preached, hot blood welled up from out of the mouths of fully sixty monks, and sixty monks, giving up the precepts, returned to lay life,¹ saying “This is difficult to do, Blessed One, very difficult to do, Blessed One.” But the minds of sixty other monks, free from attachment, became liberated from the depravities.

These passages and the other materials we have looked at above show us, then, two things: First, they show us that the idea of the merit and demerit associated with the qualifications of the recipient of a donation is constant from the Vedic literature through the early Buddhist materials, down to the Mahāyāna sūtras with which we are here primarily concerned. Second, and more specifically, it has become clear from the passages to which we have referred from the Pāli Nikāyas, and from the fact that they have parallels in the Chinese Āgamas, that the formulaic expression or episode of monks deciding to give up the monkhood due to their dissatisfaction with their own lack of worthiness is both old and pan-Buddhist. The *Ratnarāśi* as well as other Mahāyāna texts have inherited this formula, changing it very little if at all. This second fact is quite interesting, and bears further examination.

The expression of resignation from the monkhood is a rather common cliché in Buddhist literature.² We are fortunate that one of the few scholars to have given

¹ *sikkham paccakkhāya hīnāyāvattimsu.*

² In the Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi* and elsewhere the technical term is 捨戒還俗. The same Chinese term is found, for instance, in the *Samyuktāgama* T. 99 (1144) (II) 302c19. The corresponding Pāli version at SN ii.217,31 has *sikkham paccakkhāya hīnāyavattā bhavanti*, “having renounced the precepts they became returners to the inferior [status of layman].” See CPD s.v. āvattati (2), citing numerous passages for the cliché. See also the Pāli verb *vibbhamati*, discussed by Horner 1938-66: i.60,

serious attention to Buddhist institutional history, Matsuda Shindō, has studied just this issue, the return of monks to the secular life and the motivations which led them to that choice.¹ The motivations for the decision to give up the robes are various, it seems, and Matsuda has offered a classification which includes attachment to parents, wives, and other relatives, abandonment of the robes due to pressure from royal authorities, and forcible defrocking by the monastic community (that is to say, expulsion). Other “internal” causes include the inability to control one’s sexual desire, dissatisfaction with the difficulty of the monastic life or with the Buddhist teaching, difficulty in getting along with others, and so on.² Since it is not my intention to repeat Matsuda’s studies here, we will refer to only a few instances of this widespread phenomenon of abandonment of the monastic robes, and try in this regard to emphasize the place of the *Ratnarāśi* within the Buddhist tradition as a whole.

The first thing we note is the apparent relative lack of severity with which some texts view the decision to leave the monastic community. This may be illustrated with the story of Soṇa found in the canonical Nikāya / Āgama literature.³ As a monk, Soṇa makes a tremendous effort to progress spiritually, pacing up and down in walking meditation until the ground is covered in blood from his feet, which he has paced raw in his zeal. It then occurs to him however that, since he is not free from the depravities and yet his family possesses wealth, he might quit the monkhood, enjoy his family posses-

note 3.

¹ See Matsuda Shindō 1979a, 1979b, 1981a. I have profited much from Matsuda’s references.

² Among Matsuda’s papers referred to in the previous note, the most detailed is 1981a.

³ The episode is found in the following: Vin i.182,1-10 = AN iii.374,12-18 = T. 26 (123) (I) 611c29-612a17 = T. 99 (254) (II) 62c4-8 = T. 125 (23.3) (II) 612a22-28 (see also: T. 1421 [XXII] 146a25-26; T. 1425 [XXII] 481c8-18; T. 1428 [XXII] 844b7-13). In the quotation, the expression “Giving up the precepts” is found in AN but not in Vin. In the *Kaīcanakkhandha Jātaka* 56 (Jāt i.276) another monk very similarly decides to quit the monkhood, the burden of upholding all the various rules being too much for him. After the Buddha personally instructs him only to pay attention to verbal, bodily and mental actions, he achieves arhatship.

sions and create merit (*puñña*). He then thinks: “Giving up the precepts (*sikkham paccakkhāya*) and returning to the lay life (*hīnāyāvattitvā*), why don’t I enjoy my wealth and make merit?” The Buddha, in this case, dissuades him from this course of action.

Another example also comes from the Pāli Vinaya, which contains a discussion of the ways in which a monk might express his dissatisfaction with the monastic life, giving reasons why he longs to give it up.¹ The subsequent text clarifies what the monk might say if he indeed were to give it up. The monk might want to be a householder, attendant, follower of another sect, and so on, and he thinks about and longs for his family, feeling the responsibility to support them. He further reflects on the ways that he might seek his own livelihood if he were to leave the monkhood, and thinks:² “I have a village, and by means of that too I may live. I have a town, and by means of that too I may live. I have fields ... I have possessions ... I have gold ... I have gold coins ... I have skills and by means of that I will live.” This and the episode quoted in the previous paragraph strongly suggest that the economic ties between a Buddhist monk and the family he left behind were not entirely broken, and implies that were a monk to decide to leave the order he might have ample opportunity to support himself and his family upon his return to society. When the dissatisfied monk contemplates leaving the monkhood, he thinks: “I [will] support myself as a householder ... upāsaka ... ārāmika ... sāmaṇera,” and so on.³ There does not seem to be any implication that the social roles open to him are in any way more limited than they were before he entered the monkhood.

A final example from Pāli literature is found in the *Milindapañha*, which contains a lengthy discussion of why the Buddhist monastic community is not looked down upon

¹ Beginning Vin iii.24,23.

² Vin iii.26,17-22.

³ Vin iii.27,5-7.

even when certain of its members choose to quit it.¹ Several interesting similes are offered, from among which it may suffice to quote but one:²

The flowers on even the best of shrubs growing on dry land, sire —the double-jasmine— are (sometimes) eaten through by insects so that the shrivelled shoots among them come to naught. But a double-jasmine shrub is not despised because these come to naught — the flowers that remain on it pervade every quarter with their true perfume. Even so, sire, those who revert to the secular life after they have gone forth in the Dispensation of the Conqueror (*jīnasāsane pabbahitvā hīnāyāvattanti*) are like the double-jasmine flowers that have been eaten through by insects and, deprived of their colour and perfume —the moral habits being as it were colourless— are not capable of maturing. But the Dispensation of the Conqueror is not despised because of the reversion of these to the secular life — those monks that remain there pervade the world with the devas with the lovely perfume of moral habit (*sīlavaraghandha*).

What is most interesting about this passage is that the possibility of monks leaving the monastic community and reverting to secular life is taken for granted, and indeed the expression used to indicate this is a stock phrase in Pāli. Not all references to the practice of giving up the robes, however, are so neutral. The strict and unapproving stance of at least one strand of the canonical tradition can be seen in the stricture, expressed in the *Majjhima* and *Samyutta Nikāyas*, that:³ “For this ... is death in the discipline of the noble, namely, giving up the precepts and returning to lay life.”

With this issue of abandonment of the monastic life we have stumbled, as it were, upon an important point, perhaps, but one that seems occasionally to have been seriously

¹ The whole passage is Dilemma 56 (= 6.6), Trenckner 1880: 246,12-252,30.

² Trenckner 1880: 251,20-30. The translation is that of Horner 1964: II.61.

³ MN ii.258,14-16 = SN ii.271,13-14: *maraṇaṃ hetarā ... ariyassa vinaye yo sikkhaṃ paccakkhāya hīnāyāvattati*. The parallel at T. 99 (1260) (II) 345c19 does not seem to be a criticism of giving up monasticism per se so much as a criticism of being a monk who loses control of his passions and therefore ceases to find delight in the monastic life. I think there is a difference, but one would have to study the *Samyukāgama* carefully to see if this is indicative of a general ideological stance.

misunderstood by some students of Buddhism. It is one of the fundamental facts of Buddhist "renunciation" that it is a reversible state. Unlike Brahmanical world renunciation, in Buddhism there appears to be none of the legal severance of worldly connections which apparently made it virtually impossible for a Brahmanical ascetic to give up that state and revert to lay life.¹ This is true not only in contemporary Buddhist societies such as Thailand where temporary ordination is virtually the rule, but appears to have been so from the very beginnings of Indian Buddhism. This is not to say that giving up the monkhood was encouraged, but only that legal obstacles, of Buddhist canon law or of so-called secular law, appear not to have been placed in the way of such a choice.² It is not clear what societal obstacles may have existed, however. We might expect, for instance, that the nature of the economic relations between a Buddhist renunciant and the family he left behind would influence social pressures regarding the reappearance of a renunciant. If a monk upon taking ordination truly gave up any claims he may have had on the family wealth (which is not certain), we would expect that the economic interests

¹ In this regard at least, concerning Buddhism, the conclusions drawn by Y. Krishan 1969 are completely erroneous. I do not know what the theoretical or the actual situation was with the Jainas. But in so far as the difference between Buddhist and Brahmanical ascetics is concerned, the opinions of the respective traditions concerning the possibility of giving up the avocation and returning to lay life constitutes one essential difference between them. (With regard to Krishan's study, even if the author did not have a good knowledge of Buddhist literature, that he did not recall Aśoka's so-called "schism edict," in which the emperor apparently threatens to return recalcitrant monks to the lay life, is puzzling.)

In a related matter, it is possible that the very name of one of the rival sects of early Buddhism, the Ājīvikas, refers to "those who take vows for life," and aims to contrast these ascetics with the Buddhists, whose vows are reversible. Basham 1951: 103 discusses this theory, for which he credits Kern (1903: 6, note 2), saying that "this interpretation [of the etymological meaning of *ājīvika*] is by no means illegitimate." He also says: "It is by no means impossible that the word *ājīvika* ... indicated the lifelong character of the vows taken by the followers of Makkhali Gosāla and by the free-lance Ājīvikas, in contrast to the temporary vows of the Buddhist *saṅgha*."

² It is, I think, well known that renouncers who abandon their renunciation are said in the dharma literature to be compelled to become slaves. This is stated in *Viṣṇusmṛti* 5.152, *Yajñavalkya* 2.183, *Nārada* 5.35, *Kātyāyana* 731, and see Olivelle 1984: 149-50. I do not know whether any studies have been done on the applicability of these dharmaśāstric "codes" (which are in any case not codified law as we are familiar with that concept) to non-Hindus. If modern experience is any guide (and it may well not be!), different communities were governed by different sets of codes. This will be an interesting issue to explore in the future.

of the family might exert pressure on the Buddhist community and secular authorities to make it more difficult for a monk to leave the monkhood — if the alternative was a return to his former status and full legal rights. This is unfortunately a question we can do no more than notice here in passing.

We can also not even begin to answer what is perhaps nothing but a metaphysical question, namely whether the Buddhist understanding of renunciation (*pravrajya*) attempts to have things both ways: to follow the renunciant ideal, while at the same time not paying the price of actual detachment and full and complete dissociation from the world, as this was understood in Hindu circles. I am not certain even that this question is well formed, in the sense that I do not know if I have correctly understood all the starting conditions correctly, but as we continue our studies of Buddhist renunciation it will be an interesting question to keep in mind.

Returning to the case at hand, however, although we can certainly not hope to be comprehensive, there are other types of examples which we may also mention. We find in the *Upāyakaṣālyajñānottarabodhisattvapariṣcchā* the following:¹

In a future age there will be monks who have left the household life and studied the path within my teaching. At some time, being slandered by others they may, for this reason, become ashamed, and some might fail to take delight in the Buddha's teaching and giving up the precepts return to lay life. But when slandered they should contemplate the Tathāgata, thinking: Even the Tathāgata, who successfully amassed all the good qualities and became very spiritually powerful, was slandered; how can we not be

¹ I translate the Chinese from T. 310 (38) (XI) 606a7-13. The Tibetan text is found in Peking 'i, 44a6-b1, sTog cha, 125a5-b1: *phyi ma'i dus na bstan pa 'di la rab tu byung ba'i dge slong dag 'byung bar 'gyur te / de dag la yang dag pa ma yin pa'i skur pa btab pas / de dag 'gyod pa dang / sems zhum par 'gyur zhing / de dag mngon par mi dga' ba dang / nyams pa la 'jug par 'gyur bas / de dag skur pa btab pa'i tshe na / 'di skad du de bzhin gshegs pa dkar po'i chos thams cad dang ldan pa de nyid kyis kyang skur pa brnyes par gyur na / bdag cag gis lta ci'i phyir mi rnyed ces / de bzhin gshegs pa rjes su dran par byed cing / de dag de'i tshe na skur pa de zil gyis mnan nas / tshangs par spyod pa yongs su dag pa yongs su byang ba spyod par 'gyur ba dang / nyams pa la 'jug par mi 'gyur bar bya ba'i phyir ro //*. See in Chinese also T. 345 (XII) 164c10-14, and T. 346 (XII) 177a16-19 (?). See Chang et al. 1983: 460.

slandered? And so thinking they should get rid of feelings of shame, and having gotten rid of the shame they will cultivate the pristine practice of purity.

The Chinese text does not make it clear here whether these monks then return to the monkhood, or merely cultivate their practice as laymen, but the Tibetan is quite clear that they will not, after all, give up the monkhood.

In the context of this type of example the reader will no doubt also bring to mind the famous episode in the second chapter of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*,¹ in which five thousand monks and nuns, male and female lay followers, full of pride, without roots of good, thinking they had some attainments without actually having them and thinking they had some understanding without actually having it, left the assembly. It is crucial to notice, however, that what is stated here is that these followers *leave the assembly*, not that they abandon their monastic status (and indeed the group includes unordained as well as ordained followers). The formula and process of renouncing the monkhood is quite different from that of merely leaving the assembly, and in fact there exists a distinct stock expression which refers to leaving the assembly without consenting.² An example is found in the *Majjhima Nikāya*:³ “Then the renunciant Potaliputta did not approve at all of what was spoken by the reverend Samiddhissa, nor contradict it, and neither approving nor contradicting, rising from his seat he departed.” Therefore, a clear and sharp typological difference should be maintained between the phenomenon of merely leaving the assembly at which some doctrine with which one cannot agree is being preached, and that of abandoning the monastic life altogether. Not only in terms of narrative, but also in terms of sociological and religious meaning, there is a significant difference between the

¹ SP 38.12-39.2.

² See *Vinaya* iv.153 (Horner 1938-66: 3.62).

³ MN iii.207,28-30: *atha kho potaliputto paribbājako āyasmato samiddhissa bhāsitaṃ neva abhinandi na paṭikkosi anabhinanditvā appaṭikkhositvā utthāyāsanā pakkāmi.*

two phenomena.

Let us refer to several other examples in which the former, merely leaving the assembly, seems to be the case. The *Mañjuśrīvihārasūtra* has the following episode.¹ After Mañjuśrī preaches a sermon concerning the unknowability of all things and so forth, five hundred monks get up and leave the assembly saying, essentially, that they cannot stand to look at or listen to Mañjuśrī. Mañjuśrī, however, praises them to Śāriputra, explaining that since there is no actually existent Mañjuśrī there is consequently no Mañjuśrī to look at, and so on. Hearing this, the monks turn around and come back, asking for an explanation. Mañjuśrī explains that things are not to be known by cognition or wisdom, because things simply are as they are. If the disciples of the Tathāgata so practice, they are fit to be honored and to receive alms. Four of the five hundred monks realize awakening, and the remaining hundred fall into hell. However, those hundred in hell will be reborn in the Tuṣita heaven. They will later be able to hear the law as members of the first assembly of the Tathāgata Maitreya, and attain Arhathood. In the *Suṣthitamatidevaputrapariṣcchā*, five hundred monks who cannot accept the profound teaching which has been preached to them become scared and fall into hell, but it is said that they will quickly escape and attain nirvāṇa.² The *Pusa yingluo jing* 菩薩瓔珞經 also contains a reference to five hundred monks who, upon hearing a preaching about *śūnyatā*, get up and leave the assembly.³

It is probably this same situation which is implied in the story of Devadatta's abandonment of the monastic community. And in fact the relationship between legends

¹ T. 470 (XIV) 510b-511b, with the detailed discussion at 511a5-b21 = T. 471 (XIV) 512c-514a, especially 513b12-514a7. See Goshima 1986: 59-60.

² Chinese: T. 310 (36) (XI) 587c18-588a11; T. 341 (XII) 130a7-27; T. 342 (XII) 148c8-149a10. (The passage is omitted in Chang et al. 1983: 63-65.) Tibetan: sTog dkon brtsegs, cha 56a5-57a2; Peking dkon brtsegs, zi 344b4-345a5. See Goshima 1986: 60.

³ T. 656 (XVI) 16c29-17a2.

concerning the schismatic Devadatta and episodes in which monks leave the assembly in which some difficult or, to them, unattractive doctrine is being preached has been discussed in a very interesting way by Goshima Kiyotaka.¹ It is important to note that in the story of Devadatta, he leads away five hundred monks in order to set up his own community. After they are brought back, Sāriputta suggests to the Buddha that they be re-ordained. The Buddha is emphatic, however, in regarding their original ordination as still in force. Merely departing the assembly has not voided their status as monks in good standing.

Although this is not the case in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, in the *Ratnarāsi*, *Kāśyapaparivarta* and other texts the departing followers are in many cases treated with a certain profound sympathy. I wonder, however, whether any distinction is being made between departure due to a feeling of one's own inadequacy and that motivated by pride or, essentially, doctrinal conflict. This sort of distinction might be understandable, but I have so far failed to detect such a pattern. With regard specifically to the episode quoted above from the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, Goshima has suggested the interpretation that the five hundred schismatic monks who were not able to understand the Buddha's preaching, and thus got up and left, is the image of Mahāyānists as seen from the point of view of the traditional communities. When, in the sequel, those five hundred monks return to the community and preach to Subhūti and the great disciples, this represents according to

¹ Goshima 1986: 57. Concentrating on early Mahāyāna texts, Goshima suggests, for instance that the authors of early Mahāyāna texts, considering themselves to be carrying out the "second turning of the wheel of the law," were careful to avoid the name of Devadatta, since they themselves were almost labeled as "second schismatics." On this account, the Mahāyānists may have perceived themselves as the orthodoxy, defending their own Mahāyāna communities, in opposition to the mainstream communities, which they perceived as aberrant. They thus modified and used in their literature the episode of the schism occasioned by Devadatta. For details concerning the story of Devadatta's attempted schism Goshima refers to the textual sources on p. 67, note 31, and the reader may also consult H. Durt in *Hōbōgirin* 444-45, s.v. chū. Goshima also refers to a senior thesis submitted to the Faculty of Letters of Kyoto University in 1982 by Matsuda Yūko 松田裕子 titled "Devadatta Denshō no Kentō" Devadatta 伝承の検討 [An investigation of the legend of Devadatta], to which I have not however had access.

Goshima the ideal image of the Mahāyānists themselves, who considered that the Mahāyāna is itself the orthodox teaching of the Buddha.¹ While I wonder if this is not also reading too much into the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, it seems in any case obvious that such an interpretation will not fit with the usage of the pericope in the *Ratnarāṣi*.

While the legal acceptability of the renunciation of the monkhood is unquestionable, it is likewise clear that the decision to leave the monastic community was sometimes portrayed in a very negative light. In this regard, we should well recall that in the *Ratnarāṣi* itself the monks regard those who choose to leave the monkhood with disdain, and it is the Buddha who rebukes them for their lack of understanding. This is not, of course, as we have said so many times already, history or any factual reporting of real events, but it does suggest something about the ideology of the authors of the *Ratnarāṣi*. I would suggest that the authors of the text were aware of the stigma attached to abandonment of the monkhood, but meant to make a rather different point, namely that as important as it is to be a monk—and there is no question that in the tradition of the *Ratnarāṣi* this is a supreme goal—it is even more important to be a good and moral monk. If one cannot, while a monk, uphold the precepts and thereby make himself into a recipient capable of generating (or providing the opportunity for) merit for the donor, it is better off to leave the monkhood, lest one be forced to survive on alms which will produce no merit, or even produce harm, for the donor.

Finally, I referred above to the rather common pericope of a prediction that those who, in the (narrative) present, leave the assembly will, at some future time, attain rebirth as members of the first assembly of Maitreya, the future Buddha. I have discussed several questions relating to Maitreya above, but here I would like to change the focus just a bit. The different texts quoted have shown us that the prediction that those who

¹ Goshima 1986: 58.

have somehow failed to attain awakening in the present will nevertheless attain a chance, if not of liberation, at least of hearing the teachings of a Buddha in the (nonspecific) future time of Maitreya, is a stock formula. This idea seems to be entirely absent in the Nikāya / Āgama corpus, as is virtually any significant reference to Metteya / Maitreya.¹ Furthermore, it does not seem to be specifically related to any sort of cultic activities, but rather to fit into the pattern that Schopen has discussed, albeit in another context entirely, as a “generalized religious goal.”² That is, there seems to be, as far as my small sample can suggest, a relatively invariant formula, consisting of the assertion that while not attaining present spiritual fruits someone will in fact in the future get, as it were, a “second chance,” or will even be guaranteed liberation. This “second chance” consists of rebirth as a member of the first teaching community of the future buddha Maitreya. (It is not actually specified that those concerned will be monks or nuns, which may or may not be significant.) This whole formula seems, however, to be entirely unrelated to any sort of Maitreya cult, and as such should be investigated further.

We have so far been concerned primarily with the, so to speak, individual ordinary monk. Such an individual has, it seems, no special place in the institutional or bureaucratic arrangement of the renunciant community. He may have one or more specified roles, such as alms beggar or wilderness dweller, but these are clearly not administrative roles. The *Ratnarāṣi* does devote attention, however, to the just the question of the administrative organization of the renunciant community, once again, I would suggest, indicating its character as a sort of “Vinaya” text. Let us turn now to a consideration of this discussion.

¹ On Maitreya in the Āgamas, see Matsumoto 1911: 93-107.

² See Schopen 1977.

Textual Sources:

I) *Maitreya-Mahāsimhanāda*. The Tibetan text is found at M 148a2-149a1 = D 89b3-90b1 = P 83b3-84b1 = S 182a2-183a5, the Chinese at T. 310 [XI] 507a10-b2:

byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po byams pas seng ge'i sgra bsgrags pa 'di bshad pa na / 'khor de nas dge slong lnga brgya stan las langs te dong ngo // de nas gnas brtan 'od srung chen pos dge slong lnga brgya po de dag la 'di skad smras so // dge sbyong chen po dag khyed cag yo byad bsnyungs pa'i gtam brjod pa'i tshe stan las langs te gar 'dong / de skad ces smras pa dang / gnas brtan 'od srung chen po la dge slong lnga brgya po de dag gis 'di skad ces smras so // btsun pa 'od srung chen po byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po byams pas yo byad bsnyungs pa'i gtam de lta bu bstan pa'i gnas de dag ni srid par dka' ba lags pas / bdag cag 'di snyam du bdag cag ni yo byad bsnyungs pa'i yon tan de dag la yang dag par mi snang bas bdag cag phyir khyim du 'dong gor ma chag go / de ci'i phyir zhe na / dad pas byin pa ni reg par dka' zhing sbyang bar dka' ba'i phyir ro snyam du sems pa'i slad du'o //

de nas 'jam dpal gzhon nur gyur pas dge slong de dag la legs so zhes bya ba byin te / rigs kyi bu dag legs so legs so // gang dag dad pas byin pa la yongs su longs spyod par mi spro ba dag gis ni de ltar 'dzem pa dang ldan pa dang / 'gyod pa dang ldan par bya ste / nyin gcig la lan brgya rab tu byung ba phyir spangs pa ni bla'i / tshul khrims yongs su ma dag pas dad pas byin pa la yongs su longs spyod pa ni de lta ma yin no //

de nas bcom ldan 'das la 'jam dpal gzhon nur gyur pas 'di skad ces gsol to // bcom ldan 'das bcom ldan 'das kyis dad pas stsal ba ji ltar rjes su gnang bar mdzad lags / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / 'jam dpal ngas ni rigs pa dang grol ba la dad pas byin pa rjes su gnang ngo //

de nas 'jam dpal gzhon nur gyur pas dge slong lnga brgya tsam po de dag la 'di skad ces smras so // tshe dang ldan pa dag khyed cag sbyor cig / rtsol cig / 'bod cig / sangs rgyas 'byung ba ni rnyed par dka' ba yin gyis / khyed cag rab tu byung ba las phyir ma ldog cig / de nas 'jam dpal gzhon nur gyur pa la dge slong lnga brgya tsam po de dag gis 'di skad ces smras so // 'jam dpal bdag cag gis ji ltar sbyar bar bgyi lags / 'jam dpal gyis smras pa / dge slong dag khyed kyis ji lta ji ltar sbyor ba dang / 'bad pa dang / rtsol bar byed pa na / chos 'ga' yang sbyor bar mi byed / chos 'ga' yang 'byed par mi byed pa dang / chos 'ga' yang skyed bar mi byed / chos 'ga' yang 'gog par mi byed pa dang / chos 'ga' yang thob par mi byed / chos 'ga' yang spong bar mi byed pa dang /

*chos 'ga' yang 'bri bar mi byed / chos 'ga' yang 'phel bar mi byed pa de ltar sbyor bar
 gyis shig / dge slong gang de ltar sbyor ba de ni chos 'ga' yang rtogs par mi 'gyur ro //*
*gang chos 'ga' yang rtogs par mi 'gyur ba de ni gar yang mi 'gro / gang nas kyang mi
 'ong ngo //* *gang la 'gro ba med pa de la yang ni 'ong ba yang 'ga' yang med do //* *de ni
 'ong ba med pa dang / 'gro ba med pa'i dge slong zhes bya ste / gang du yang rten pa
 yang ma yin / mi rten pa yang ma yin no //* *bstan pa 'di bshad pa na / dge slong lnga
 brgya po de dag len pa med par zag pa rnam las sems rnam par grol lo //*

Chapter 6

Supervision

The discussion which makes up chapter IV of the *Ratnarāśi* concerning the superintending monk comprises an explicit and detailed account of at least some of the duties and responsibilities of this office. For office it is, and although little is said in the *Ratnarāśi* about who exactly the superintending monk is, how he is selected and so on, it is clear on the one hand that he is a monk rather than a layman, and on the other that he is responsible for the well-being not only of the monks and most especially the, we may say, religious specialists, but also likewise for the care of the stūpa. It is stated that the superintending monk should assure that wilderness dwelling monks are not burdened with mundane tasks, that alms begging monks enjoy delicious food, and that the yogācāra meditation monks should not have their quiet disturbed. He must encourage studious monks to apply themselves to their study, and arrange for those dedicated to preaching to have audiences and favorable conditions in which to present their sermons. It is also his responsibility to take care of certain aspects of financial administration.

Very little has been written on the duties, offices and officers of the Indian Buddhist monastic organization in general, and it is hardly possible for me to remedy that situation here.¹ Rather, I will focus most of my attention on what we can find out about just one office, that of superintending monk. The first and perhaps pivotal problem, as is so often the case at this stage in our knowledge, is a terminological one. What technical

¹ A few studies are, however, available: see Lévi and Chavannes 1915; Njammasch 1970, 1974; S. Matsuda 1981b, 1981c, 1982a, 1982b, 1983; Satō 1963: 310-27; and Tomomatsu 1920.

terms are we talking about, what are the relevant translation equivalents, and what, in the end, are the people who hold these titles supposed to do?

The Sanskrit “original” for the term I have translated in chapter IV as “superintending monk” is available in a quotation in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* as *vaiyāpṛtyakara bhikṣu*. The Tibetan rendering in the *Ratnarāśi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is *dge sbyong zhal ta byed pa*, and the Chinese translations of both the *Ratnarāśi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have 營事比丘. We will see below that many administrative offices in the monastic organization are held by non-monks, so it is important to realize that here in the *Ratnarāśi* we are dealing beyond question with a post held by a monk. Now, what about the term *vaiyāpṛtyakara* itself? Let us start with that.

The word appears in the *Mahāvvyūtpatti*, with the Tibetan form as *zhal ta pa*.¹ The dictionary of Tse ring dbang rgyal also has the same Tibetan form, with the Sanskrit equivalent given as *vaiyāpṛta*.² The same term, although as we will see having, perhaps, a different referent, is found in Pāli as *veyyāvaccakara*, and again in the canonical language of the Jainas, *Ardhamāgadhī*. In Classical Sanskrit we also encounter the word, for instance in the *Arthaśāstra* and other sources, including lexicographical works, but there is no indication that any particular office is indicated.³

¹ The entry (8736) has *zhal ta pa* = *vaiyāvṛtyakaraḥ*, so spelled in Sakaki 1916 and Ishihama and Fukuda 1989; Sakaki reports the xylograph reading as *vaiyapṛityaka*, but the Mhy. Index writes *vaiyāvṛtyakara*. See below for the v / p alternation, but anyway the long vowel *vaiyā* is undoubtedly correct.

² Bacot 1930: 149a. While the rendering *zhal ta byed pa* or *zhal ta pa* seems to be normal for *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, it can also stand for other terms. In the *Vinayasūtra* of Guṇaprabha, for instance, it seems to render *adhiṣṭhātr* (roughly “supervisor”). There the Tibetan version (Derge Tanjur 4117, ‘*dul ba, wu, 5b2-3*) has the sūtra *kun tu chags par gyur na zhal ta byed pa mos rjes su bstan par bya’o* //. The Sanskrit equivalent (I.175 in Sankrityayana 1981, I.178 in Bapat and Gokhale 1982) is *saṃrajyamānām adhiṣṭhātrī samanūśiṣyāt*. In another case the Tibetan version (‘*dul ba, wu, 14a3*) has II.96 as *tha snyad mi shes pa ni zhal ta byed pa bdag po nyid yin no* //. This is found in Sanskrit (Sankrityayana 1981) as *bhavaty adhiṣṭhātur apātrāgatiye svāmitvam*. There seem to be further examples in the *Vinayasūtra*, and we might expect in other texts as well.

³ Kangle 1972: 2.5.18, 2.8.22, 4.8.9. 2.8.22 lists in reference to treasury officers: *upayukta-nidhāyaka-nibandhaka-pratigrāhaka-dāyaka-dāpaka-mantri-vaiyāvṛtyakara*, translating “subordinate officer, store-keeper, recorder, receiver, person who pays, person who causes the payment to be made, the adviser

The phonetic problems of the term in its Sanskrit and Pāli forms have been treated by Lüders under the rubric of *p* / *v* alternation.¹ While it is obvious that the etymological form is that with *-p-*, this does not at all imply that the usage with Middle Indic *-v-* should be considered any less original or correct. This is especially so in the context of Buddhist materials for which, whether they are written in Sanskrit or a form of Sanskritized Prakrit, some Middle Indic background, historically or environmentally, may be presumed. I have printed *-p-* in the edition following the apparent manuscript reading of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and generally adopt this form, but we should keep in mind the fact that there simply may be no way of knowing what stage of what tradition this spelling really represents. Anyway, the matter is probably of little consequence for the use of the term in the period with which we are concerned.² I cannot say at this time if the coincidence we find between the spelling in the *Ratnarāśi* quotations in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and that in various Vinayas quoted below is important, but it is an issue to be kept in mind for its potential bearing on the question of the sectarian roots of the sūtra. What is of more immediate concern is the actual meaning of the term, and the first question we

and the helpmate.” It is suggested by 2.5.18, however, that no particular officer is meant, but rather something closer to the generic “assistant.” The meaning “sales agent” in 3.4.25-30 seems to be different although obviously related (perhaps just an applied meaning?). The word is cited by Monier-Williams 1899: 1024c in the form *vaiyāvṛṭṭyakara* from *Kalpāsūtra* and *Nāradaśmṛti*, and in the forms *vaiyāpṛtyakara* and *vaiyāvṛṭṭikara* = *bhogin* citing only the lemma L[exicographers]. Perhaps among others this is a reference to *Mañbhakośa* 454c: *vaiyāpṛtyakaro bhogī*. The commentary (Zachariae 1897: 60) has [*bhogin*] *vaiyāpṛtyakaro vyāvahārikah* / *vyāvahārikabhujamgayoh* / <*Bhallaśataka* 37>. Here again the meaning seems far from that in our texts. According to S. B. Deo 1956: 371, the *Oghaniryukti* commentary explains the *vṛṣabha* as *vaiyāvṛṭṭyakaraṇasamarthaḥ*. I am not sure what this means, and I have not been able to follow up the lead.

¹ Lüders 1954 §99. He renders *vaiyāpṛtyakara* as “Geschäftsvermittler” in the context of the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya’s *nihsargika* 10 [misprinted as 16], on which see below. See also for the phonetics Pischel 1981 §199, Geiger 1943 §38.5, v. Hinüber 1986 §181, and BHSG §2.30.

² Lüders’s discussion concerns of course the possibility of the “translation” of originally eastern Gangetic dialect forms (or those of Helmer Smith’s “koine gangetic”) into western Middle Indic. The initial phase of such a process, however it took place, would almost certainly have been completed centuries before the composition of the earliest Mahāyāna sūtras. The question, on the other hand, of what original phonetic shape the Indic original(s) of the *Ratnarāśi* had involves a different set of issues, to be discussed below.

must ask is whether the referent of the term in both Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit is the same.

Two of the earliest references to and interpretations of the term in Buddhist Sanskrit sources offered by European scholars are found in the works of Burnouf and Senart. The former understood the expression *tripiṭakasamghasya ... dharmavaiyāvṛtyam karoti* as “remplissait auprès de l’Assemblée les devoirs de serviteur de la Loi,” commenting that service to the monastic community as a domestic is what is probably intended.¹ The latter, in discussing *vaiyāvṛtya*, referred directly to the Pāli form *veyyavacca* (*sic*), remarking that it is used to mark the respects rendered by an inferior to a superior.² Childers’s dictionary, to which Senart referred, defines *veyyāvaccam* as “Service or duties performed by an inferior for a superior,” but gives for *veyyāvaccakaro* simply “one who does business or executes a commission for another, an agent.” His reference for the latter is the *Pāṭimokkha*, to which we should therefore turn our attention.

Our term *veyyāvaccakara* / *vaiyāpṛtyakara* appears in the sense of some monastic administrator in *Nihsargika* 10 in many *Prātimokṣas*.³ It is mentioned along with *ārāmika* and *upāsaka*, the latter being two types of people who might be *vaiyāpṛtyakara* for the purpose of receiving and holding in trust robes donated to a monk. The various versions and the different forms into which the relevant terms are translated are as follows:

Sarvāstivāda: *vaiyyāpṛtyakara*.⁴ 知識守園人,⁵ 執事人 with 僧蘭民 and 優婆

¹ Burnouf 1844: 273, with note 2 = 1876: 244. He is translating *Divyāvadāna* 54.16.

² Senart 1882: 594, note to Mv. i.298.19. He has apparently based his claim directly on Childers 1909: 565a. See below.

³ The exact numbering varies slightly in different texts.

⁴ Sanskrit in Finot and Huber 1913: 494.9. I have followed the spelling in the careful edition of von Simson 1986, in which *Nihsargika* 10 is found with this spelling on pages 44, 65-66, 122, 174, 220, and 271-272. Once, on pages 135-136, we find the spelling *vaiyāpṛtyakara*.

⁵ T. 1464 (XXIV) 876b7.

塞,¹ 執事人 with 守僧坊人 and 優婆塞.²

Mūlasarvāstivāda: *vaiyyāvṛtyakara*. *zhal ta byed pa*.³ 執事人 with 僧淨人 and 鄔波索迦.⁴

Theravāda: *veyyāvaccakara*.⁵

Mahāsārngika: *vaiyāpṛtyakara*.⁶ 執事人 with 蘭民 and 優婆塞.⁷

Mahīśāsaka: 執事人.⁸

Dharmaguptaka: 執事人 with 守伽藍民 and 優婆塞.⁹

Kāśyapīya: 執事人 with 守園人 and 優婆塞.¹⁰

It is clear from the stories introduced in these texts to justify or rationalize the promulgation of a Vinaya rule that the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is conceived of, at least in this context, as a non-monk. What is more, it is indicated that the role cannot be one which cancels or overlaps with that of the *ārāmika*. The whole question of what and who *ārāṃikas* were is a very difficult one, but it is relatively safe to say that they were employees of the monastery or under compulsion to work in or for it. The term does not refer to a post or office but rather to a status, and thus at least in some contexts may belong to a different “logical category” from *vaiyāpṛtyakara*.¹¹

¹ T. 1435 (XXIII) 47a15-16.

² T. 1436 (XXIII) 473a21-23.

³ Sanskrit in Banerjee 1977: 27.17; Tibetan in Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana 1915: 96.13 = Huth 1891: 8.16. How trustworthy the exact spelling in Banerjee’s edition is I do not know.

⁴ T. 1454 (XXIV) 503a3-4.

⁵ Vadekar 1939: 8.1; Oldenberg 1897-1883: iii.220,4.

⁶ Sanskrit in Pachow & Mishra 1956: 16.17; better than this is the text in Tatia 1975: 14.29. One should now also refer to the transcriptions of the manuscript in Roth 1970: 167 and again in Nolot 1991: 164, note 11. (It is hard to know which of the latter to trust most, but probably Nolot’s edition may be considered trustworthy.) Nolot 164-66 also offers a translation. She has, however, rendered *vaiyāpṛtyakara* simply by “agent.” (Similarly without precision, *ārāmika* is rendered “serviteur.”)

⁷ T. 1426 (XXII) 305c28, and 551b11-12.

⁸ T. 1422 (XXII) 28c15, and 196b15.

⁹ T. 1430 (XXII) 613a20, and 1025b11-12.

¹⁰ T. 1460 (XXIV) 661c3-4.

¹¹ Schopen Forthcoming has offered some observations on *ārāṃikas*, but much more remains to be

The *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* contains a further expression which seems to suggest the humble status of the servility indicated by *vaiyāprtyakara*. The passage recounts that a poor man conceived the thought of faith upon seeing the Blessed One along with his retinue of auditors eating. This earned him a great mass of merit, eventually leading to his liberation. Knowing this, the Blessed One said, in verse: “Those who rejoice in that, and those who are *vaiyāprtyakara*, have no lack of remuneration; rather, both (groups of people) have a portion of merit.” It is not absolutely clear what *vaiyāprtyakara* means here, and evidently the Tibetan translators did not understand the term in any technical sense. Moreover the verse is actually found in a completely different context in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, where the reference is to the giving of gifts.¹ Anyway, while the overall meaning may not be, it is clear that the term in this passage cannot refer to any sort of monastic administrative office.²

We have seen significant evidence that in one sense, or perhaps in some strata of the tradition, the *vaiyāprtyakara* is a humble or relatively humble position. A sort of confirmation of this sense of the term comes to us from a comparison with Jaina materials.

The term *veyāvaḍḍiya* appears in *Ardhamāgadhī* in the sense of “service, assistance.”³ An interesting comparison of the Jaina and Buddhist materials, and a

said. I hope to be able to address some of the remaining problems in my paper on slavery and Buddhist ideology, in progress.

¹ The passage is found in Lévi 1932b: 57.8-12, with the Tibetan at 196.18-25, and a French translation on page 128. The verse is found in Pāli at AN iii.41, 22-23. In what is apparently a Chinese parallel to the latter at T. 125 (II) 681bc, it is hard to nail down what should correspond to this verse. In Sanskrit the verse runs *ye tatrābhyānumodante vaiyāprtyakarāś ca ye / anūnā dakṣiṇā teṣāṃ te 'pi puṇyasya bhāginah //*, but the Tibetan for pāda b is *de'i las ni nyams su su len pa*.

² The passage has been noted by Filliozat 1980: 244 in his discussion of *puṇya*, who renders: “Those who rejoice in this and who fulfil their responsibility, nothing is found wanting in their earning and they have their share of *puṇya*.”

³ See *Āyāraṅgasutta* 1.8.1.199; *Uttarajhāyana* 12.24, 12.32 (*veyāvaḍḍiyaṃ karenti*); *Nāyā-dhammakahāo* (pages) 75.7, 127.10 (*veyāvaccakaraṃ ṭhaveṃti*).

study of the Jaina sources in particular, was offered by Colette Caillat.¹ She observed that *veyāvacca* in Jaina usage is service aimed at the expiation of the stain caused by sin. In the *Vavahārasutta* service is considered to be ten-fold: “It is taught that service is ten-fold, namely: service to masters, preceptors, elders, initiates, the ill, penitents, coreligionists, families [of the masters], the sect, the community. A śramaṇa carrying out service to his master (preceptor, etc.) is an ascetic who greatly destroys (the karma he has) and greatly puts a stop (to future karma production).”² The *Kappasutta* details the services to be performed by an ascetic being punished by isolation, namely helping others rise, follow, sit down, lie, and disposing of excretions, and it also refers to serving (monks; *veyāvaccakara*) who assist in taking care of the body of a deceased monk.³ Although it is clear here that this service applies to Jaina monks, it is equally clear that reference is not being made to any monastic office, and most certainly not to any sort of prestigious or highly responsible position. Rather the opposite: this sort of service is humbling, to be undertaken as a penance or even, apparently, a punishment.

Although we can often not be sure of the Sanskrit or Indic equivalents of Chinese technical terms, it seems that the apparently normal Chinese equivalent for *vaiyāprtyakara* in this humble sense is 執事人. In the many examples of 執事 in Mochizuki’s encyclopedia, the term refers to a low class servant, almost certainly not a monk.⁴ It should be emphasized, however, that it is often very hard to know what Indic term lies behind a certain Chinese “equivalent,” and in many of the cases quoted by Mochizuki I consider it problematic whether the Chinese 執事 actually reflects *vaiyāprtyakara* at all.

¹ See Caillat 1965: 130-34

² An edition and translation in Schubring 1966: 10.35: *dasavihe veyāvacce pannatte tamjahā: āyariyaveyāvacce uvajjhāya-v° thera-v° seha-v° gilāṇa-v° tavassi-v° sāhammiya-v° kula-v° gaṇa-v° saṃgha-v° āyariyaveyāvaccaṃ kareṃāne samane nigganthe mahānījare mahāpajjivasāne bhavai....* and so on for the rest. My translation is indebted to those of Schubring 1966, and Caillat 1965: 131.

³ Edition in Schubring 1905, translation in 1910: paragraphs 4.26 and 4.24.

⁴ Mochizuki 1932-36: 2254b-2255a.

There is no way to resolve this problem at the moment, so we must be content to note (again) the need for considerable caution when dealing with Chinese materials.¹

If, then, the general uses in Pāli and Vinaya Sanskrit seem to point to a humble status, is there any evidence at all that the *Ratnarāśī* usage is not altogether anomalous? In fact there is, and quite a bit of it. Let us start with a Gupta inscription dated by Jean Phillipe Vogel, its editor, to probably 403 C.E.² The inscription, which is engraved on a rather large (diameter 46 cm) copper cauldron and records its donation, is short and reads, in Vogel's transcription:

saṃ 80 + 3 māghasūkladi 5 [vai]yāvrtyakara-buddhadāsothāpi[ta] //
śibipuropavana-rādhika-vi[hā]ra-cāturdiśa-sarvāstivādi-bhikṣu-saṃghasya //

This may be translated:

In the year 83, in [the month] Māgha, the bright fortnight, the fifth day, dedicated by the *vaiyāvrtyakara* Buddhadāsa to the community of monks belonging to the universal Sarvāstivādin order located at the Rādhika monastery in the park of Śibipura.

This inscription tells us several things. Such a copper vessel cannot have been inexpensive. So the *vaiyāvrtyakara* Buddhadāsa was not a poor man. Moreover, the status he chose to record of himself for posterity, or rather for the sake of his merit, was that of *vaiyāvrtyakara*.³ I do not know exactly how to gloss the syntax of the com-

¹ It is moreover not necessarily true even that terms which might look like they represent *vaiyāvrtyakara* in Chinese actually do represent it. For instance, in an interesting passage in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra*, in a discussion of the benefits of charity, it is stated that a gift of slaves (*dāsa-dāsī*) and laborers (*las byed pa'i mi* = **karmakara*) will bring freedom to the giver. One Chinese version (T. 316 [XI] 823b5-6), however, uses for **karmakara* a term which we might have been tempted to confuse with *vaiyāvrtyakara*, 營作人. The equivalent passage in Xuanzang's translation is T. 310 (12) 240a26, where however there is no terminological confusion possible. The Tibetan translation clarifies the technical terms, P wi 65b2-3 = sTog ga 145b7.

² Vogel 1921-22. I have modified only the transcription of *sa* by *sha* and the epigraphist's odd convention of transcribing our *ca* by *cha*. The translation is my own.

³ Notice that this early fifth century Sanskrit inscription maintains what might be considered the

pound *śibipuropavana-rādhika-vihāra-cāturdiśa-sarvāstivādi-bhikṣu-saṃgha*, especially with regard to the place within it of *caturdiśa*, so my translation is tentative. What is perhaps meant is that the gift is offered to a local chapter of the Sarvāstivādins, but in any case it is not critical that we understand that portion of the inscription for the present discussion.

It is possible, but certainly not explicitly so stated, that this Buddhādāsa may have been a *vaiyāpṛtyakara* of the Sarvāstivādins. If true, this would suggest that in a Sarvāstivādin context *vaiyāpṛtyakara* could be a high rank. On the other hand, it is far from clear whether Buddhādāsa was a even monk, not to mention a Sarvāstivādin monk. If — and this may be a big *if* — he was a monk, we might speculate that the status of *vaiyāpṛtyakara* so overshadowed his monastic position that he omitted to mention it or, perhaps going a step further, it was not possible for one to be a *vaiyāpṛtyakara* without being a monk, and it was therefore unnecessary for Buddhādāsa to mention it at all. But, what we actually *know* from this inscription is very little. We know that Buddhādāsa was a wealthy man, and we know that this wealthy man was a *vaiyāpṛtyakara*. We also know that the latter term was known and used in the early fifth century in the region of the Punjab. On the other hand, according to at least some literary evidence, in addition to an *ārāmika* an *upāsaka* could also qualify as a *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, and there is no indication in this appellation of wealth or the lack of it. Therefore, although this tells us nothing definitive, it does provide one more piece of the puzzle. Another very interesting indication is to be found in a Vinaya text.

A passage found in the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya makes plain the high status accorded the *vaiyāpṛtyakara-bhikṣu*.¹ The text contains a discussion of stūpas and those for whom their construction is allowed. In addition to the usual list of Tathāgata,

Middle Indic variant, *vaiyāvṛtya*°, with -v-.

¹ T. 1425 (XXII) 444b7-27.

śrāvaka, pratyekabuddha, cakravartin, srotaāpanna, sakṛdāgāmin, anāgāmin and arhat, the text also refers to **vinayadhara*, dharma preachers (? 法師) and 營事德望比丘, perhaps “virtuous superintending monks”? The last three, the text says, should be referred to as Venerable (長老).¹ There is, again, nothing here which specifies anything concrete about this “superintending monk,” but it is clear that the designation is far from humble, even if this is all that is clear.

Additional examples may help clarify the question. The concluding vignette of the *Samgharakṣitāvadāna*, a tale in the *Divyāvadāna*, contains the story of a *vaiyāvṛtya-kara*, the monk Samgharakṣita in a former birth.² It is stated that although he maintained pure conduct (*brahmacarya*) his life long, he did not manage to acquire the merit necessary for spiritual progress.³ It is probable that the *dharmavaiyāvṛtyam* which he carried out and which is responsible for his wealth during his rebirth in the time of the

¹ See the article on “chōrō” in Hōbōgirin 380-92. Long ago La Vallée Poussin 1937: 288 discussed this passage based on its quotation in another Chinese text, a commentary on the *Avatamsaka* T. 1733 (XXXV) 262b19-20, as given in Oda 1917: 1114a. Unfortunately, the text in the *Avatamsaka* commentary is, at best, misleading. Oda’s dictionary has, consequently, misconstrued the division of terms. This in its turn led La Vallée Poussin to reconstruct (wrongly) the monks allowed stūpas as: “Vinayadharadharmā-cārya, Vaiyāprtyabhikṣu, and the virtuous monk.” What the *Avatamsaka* commentary actually says (without inserting punctuation in the problematic phrase) is: 又依僧祇律。有凡僧亦起塔。謂持律法師營事比丘德望比丘。應起塔。One would naturally understand, then, as Oda and following him La Vallée Poussin, did: 持律法師, 營事比丘, and 德望比丘. It would conceivably be possible to divide 持律 and 法師, but in any case 營事比丘 and 德望比丘 are clearly to be distinguished. The original text of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya itself, however, equally clearly separates 持律, 法師, and 營事德望比丘. The first may, with little doubt, be reconstructed as **vinayadhara*. The second might be **dharmabhāṇaka*, **dharmakathika* or the like, but the final term is difficult. The element 德望 (although normal as Chinese) is problematic, and I have no suggestion for what Indic term it might represent.

² The account is presented in Cowell and Neil’s 1886 edition of the *Divyāvadāna* as chapter XXV (347.2 et seq.), but is in fact a continuation of chapter XXIII, as recognized by Burnouf 1844: 332, and Dutt 1950: iii.4.46, note 1. The text is borrowed by the *Divyāvadāna* from the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya *Pravrajyavastu*, for which see the Sanskrit in Dutt just referred to, Tibetan in Eimer 1983: II.299, and translated in Burnouf also just referred to. The Chinese version in T. 749 (XVII) does not seem to offer a close parallel. The Tibetan version has *zhal ta byed par gyur cing* for what the *Divyāvadāna* edition and Dutt have as *āsīd vaiyāvṛtyakara*.

³ The term *guṇagaṇa* is not altogether clear, but it seems to me that BHSD s.v. is wrong to define it as “reckoning, counting, calculation of virtues.” Tibetan has *yon tan gyi tshogs*.

Buddha (the narrative present) refers to the duties of the *vaiyāprtyakara*.¹ If the concept is the same, and we would have no reason for thinking it is not, we can get some help in specifying some of the *vaiyāprtyakara*'s responsibilities from a reference which appears a bit earlier, in the original Vinaya context, in the same narrative series. In the same *Pravrajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya which is the original home of the *Samgharakṣitāvadāna*, we find a series of stories, used to justify the non-ordination of Nāgas, which act as a sort of introduction to the *Samgharakṣitāvadāna*. There we read the following reference to the *vaiyāprtyakara*, who is in fact a Nāga in disguise: "[in a monastery] there dwells a superintending monk (**vaiyāprtyakara bhikṣu*), and he provides all the requisites to visiting and to departing monks (**āgantukā gamikāś ca bhikṣavaḥ*)."² This is one indication of the possible responsibilities of the *vaiyāprtyakara* monk.

Although the genre of literature is entirely different, much the same situation is implied in the following from a Mahāyāna śāstra. In a discussion of the circumstances under which a bodhisattva may carry out actions which otherwise would be considered sinful, the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* states:³

The bodhisattva, carefully considering the cases of those *vaiyāprtyakaras* or *ārāṃikas* who through bad management waste the goods belonging to the

¹ Cowell and Neil 1886: 347.27-28.

² The Tibetan text and an English translation (which requires some modification) are found in Ware 1938: 58, reprised on 59. A critical edition of the Tibetan is found in Eimer 1983: II.252.21-23 (reprise on 253.3). The portion of the Tibetan that I have translated reads: *dge slong zhal ta byed pa gnas te / des dge slong glo bur du 'ongs pa dang / 'gro bar chas pa rnams la yo byad thams cad kyis stobs par byed do //*.

³ The Sanskrit is found in Wogihara 1936: 166.24-167.3: *ye ca vaiyāprtyakarā vā ārāṃikā vā sāmghikāṃ staupikāṃ vā dravyāṃ vipramādayanti anayena. svayaṃ ca paudgalikāṃ paribhramjate. taṃ bodhisattvaḥ pratisaṃkhyāya mā haiva tat karma. sa ca mithyāparibhogaḥ teṣāṃ bhaviṣyati dīrgharātram anarthāyāhitāyati tasmād ādhipatyāc cyāvayati*. The text in Dutt 1978: 114.11-14 differs slightly. For *vipramādayanti*, "wastes," which conforms with the Tibetan quoted in Wogihara's note 4 as *chud gzon pa*, Dutt reads *vipratipādayanti*, "sins with regard to." The Chinese version of Xuanzang is found in the *Yogācārabhūmi* T. 1579 (XXX) 517b28-c3. Here *vaiyāprtyakara* is rendered 衆主, perhaps "in charge of the community"? The verb with regard to which Wogihara and Dutt differ is rendered simply 取, "take." For a translation of the passage (from Tibetan?) see Tatz 1986: 71.

community or belonging to the stūpa, and who consume them as [if they were] their own personal goods, thinks: “I wish they would not do this, which will lead to negative results for them and, in the long night [of saṃsāra], is not for their benefit or advantage.” And he removes them from their positions of authority.

There is no indication here concerning whether the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is a monk or layman. It is, however, clear that he is someone in some position from which he exercises control over the economic goods of the monastic community and the stūpa, but it is not clear, for instance, what difference — if any — there is between his responsibilities and those of the *ārāmika*. In this context we had best remember that a conceptual distinction should be maintained between “employees,” or workers who are not ordained, and the specific roles assigned to monks, who are ordained but specialize to some extent in administration or infrastructure. There is no doubt a continuum here, between those who work in a monastery solely as paid (or unpaid) workers, through non- or partially ordained people who render assistance, up through fully ordained monks who carry out various tasks and roles in the administrative hierarchy. With the evidence at hand, it may remain difficult to distinguish these thoroughly, but the fact that such a distinction is theoretically possible should be kept in mind.

Other examples further clarify our problem — or, we might say, clarify that we do indeed have a problem in pinning down the exact referent of *vaiyāpṛtyakara*. In the *Avadānaśataka* we encounter the story of a young slave girl, granted her freedom by her master for reminding him of his charitable duties toward the Buddhist mendicants.¹ She enters the Buddhist order and carries out the *vaiyāpṛtya* duties under the preaching of the Buddha Kāśyapa for a thousand years, and she gives multifarious offerings and makes a vow to be born in the time of Śākyamuni through the merit she has gained. Because of

¹ The story is found in Speyer 1906-09: II.13.2-15, with a French translation in Feer 1891: 269. The Chinese translation is found at T. 200 (IV) 229b9-12.

making offerings to the Buddha Kāśyapa, she is reborn in a wealthy house and endowed with great physical beauty. It is not by any means clear here whether the expression *vaiyāprtyam kṛtam* should refer to the following recital of the many items of offering made to the Buddha Kāśyapa, and if not to what it actually refers. Nevertheless, although the protagonist is apparently a nun (she is, the text specifies, *pravrajitā*, and the Chinese translation has **bhikṣuṇī*), it does not seem likely that we have here any reference to a monastic office. In another passage in the same text, a monk offers service (the same *vaiyāprtyam kṛtam*) to four other monks.¹ Through their efforts the four gain arhatship, and the remaining monk thinks: “It is thanks to me that they have attained arhatship. Through my roots of good, my resolution (*cittotpāda*), and my sacrifice as a dharma-gift may those who have entered the order (*pravrajita*) have food without deficiency.” In fact, the story is a bit clearer in the Chinese translation, in which it is stated that the monk encourages the donors, takes care of the community and makes sure there is no want.² In return he urges the monks to practice diligently, and within three months they all attain arhatship. The Chinese version makes it rather clear that we have to do here with some monastic administrative duties. A passage in the *Varṣāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya has a monk stating before rain retreats that he will pass the rains with so-and-so as *vaiyāprtyakara*, and in such-and-such a place.³ There is no indication here however of the meaning of the term or to what office, post or status reference is being made.

In the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, a 營事比丘 is apparently responsible for educating the young monks concerning the Vinaya rules. He is instructed by the Buddha that he shall not teach dharma verses (? 句法) to those who have not yet received the upasam-

¹ Found at Speyer 1906-09: II.96.6-7. Translation in Feer 1891: 331.

² T. 200 (IV) 247a23-29.

³ The passage is in Dutt 1950: III.4.136.5-11, and again in Härtel 1956: 125. The Chinese, if I have identified the passage correctly, seems to vary somewhat from the Sanskrit text, but the term for *vaiyāprtyakara* is clear, 營事人. See T. 1445 (XXIII) 1042a16-17, 29. See also T. 1458 (XXIV) 564c.

padā ordination.¹ In another passage, the 營事比丘 seems to have undertaken to produce mud bricks, although such activity is subsequently prohibited by the Buddha,² and to dig for materials with which to build.³ The 營事比丘 makes others carry mud on their backs “like slaves.”⁴

The passages we have looked at so far do contain the same technical term that is so important in the *Ratnarāśi*, but their examination has not completely clarified the meaning or usage of the term. The same must be said about the following passage as well, except that its interest lies not in its differences from the *Ratnarāśi* passage but in its similarity. The *Sūryagarbhasūtra* contains a description of the supervisory monk virtually parallel to that in the *Ratnarāśi*.⁵

Then King Bimbisāra asked the Blessed One: “Reverend, when the Blessed One mentions the “supervisor (**vaiyāprtyakara*),” how many people are designated with the designation supervisor?”

The Blessed One said: “Great king, I permit two [kinds of] monks to be supervisors. Which two? The Arhat who has cultivated the eight liberations, and the monk who is a *śaikṣa* and *srotaāpatti*. Great king, these two [kinds of] monks I permit to carry out the actions of the supervisor.”

¹ T. 1425 (XXII) 336c5-17.

² T. 1425 (XXII) 348c10-21, and see Schmithausen 1991: 46-48, and the notes.

³ T. 1425 (XXII) 385a14-17, and see Schmithausen 1991: 49-50, and the notes.

⁴ T. 1425 (XXII) 494b25-c7, and c7-15.

⁵ Derge Kanjur 257, *mdo sde*, za 106b5-7: *de nas bcom ldan 'das la rgyal po gzugs can snying pos 'di skad ces gsol to // btsun pa bcom ldan 'das zhal ta pa zhes bgyi lags na bcom ldan 'das ji tsam gyis na zhal ta par gdags pas gdags par mdzad pa lags / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / rgyal po chen po dge slong gnyis zhal ta par rangs gnam ngo // gnyis gang yin zhe na / gang yang rnam par thar pa brgyad la sgom pa 'i dgra bcom pa dang / gang yang dge slong slob pa rgyun du zhugs pa yin te / rgyal po chen po dge slong 'di gnyis zhal ta pa 'i las byed par rang gnam ngo //*. One Chinese version is found at T. 397 (XIII) 238c26-39a2, with some differences. One might translate the Chinese: “

The Buddha said to the Great King: “There are two types of people I permit to uphold the responsibilities of the community and protect the property of the community. Which are the two? First, an Arhat who has perfected the eight liberations. Second, learners who have attained the three [other] fruits, *srotaāpatti* and so forth. I allow these two types of people to work as supervisors, and to take care of the monastic community. Other monks, those whose precepts are not perfect or whose minds are not equanimous and so forth, may not be made supervisors.” Another Chinese version is found at T. 397 (XIII) 216a25-28.

The coincidence between this passage and that in the *Ratnarāṣi* was already noticed in the seventh century by Daoxuan, who remarked on the two passages together,¹ as did Fazang not many years later.² Although, again, there seems to be a sort of extended commentary on *Ratnarāṣi* IV.1, in which these two types of monks are permitted to assume the responsibilities of supervisor, in a Japanese commentary on the **Brahmajālasūtra* dating to 1318, the *Bommōkaihon shonichijushō* 梵網戒本疏日珠鈔 of Gyōnen 凝然,³ most of the discussion is taken up with the definition of the eight liberations, and with numerous quotations. The form of the passage, in which all the key technical terms of IV.1 appear, and the explicit reference to three sets of two types of people mentioned in the *Ratnarāṣi*, shows that the passage was known to Gyōnen.⁴ He also alludes to the *Mahāsaṃnipāta* passage we have just noted from the *Sūryagarbhasūtra*.⁵ But here again, we do not find any key to unlock the mystery of the *vaiyāprtyakara*.

We have concentrated our efforts so far on the term *vaiyāprtyakara* itself, but it is likely that an examination of related terms will also help illuminate the issue. We find many stories that show us other technical terms used to refer to what seems to have been more or less the same position. According to what we read above, for example, taking care of visiting monks seems to have been one specific role of the *vaiyāprtyakara*. In this context, a story found in the 大方便佛報恩經, as well as numerous other sources, is worth translating at length, not only as an example of the responsibilities of an administrative official but also, by the way, as an example of a type of scatological reference so

¹ Both the *Sūryagarbha* and *Ratnarāṣi* Chinese passages are quoted in T. 1804 (XL) 55b12-16. See my Chinese edition of the *Ratnarāṣi*, IV.1.

² T. 1813 (XL) 616c8-12 quotes the *Sūryagarbha* passage, directly following it with the *Ratnarāṣi* quotation at 616c12-17.

³ T. 2247 (LXII) 100c1-29.

⁴ The reference (100c2) reads: 今寶梁經三箇二人.

⁵ 100c1 reads: 疏。一者能持戒等者。前大集經二種人者。

common in Buddhist literature and so commonly glossed over by many of its “puritanical” modern interpreters. The story runs as follows:¹

At that time the Blessed One and Ānanda entered Rājagṛha, and having begged alms again left the city. Outside the city gates there was a great, deep pit. The people of Rājagṛha would haul their urine and feces there and dispose of it in that pit. When it would rain the runoff water² would also flow into it. At that time there was a worm in that sewage sump, in form resembling a human being, equipped with many hands and feet (?). Gazing from a distance at the Tathāgata it raised its head from the water, and looking upon the Tathāgata tears flowed and filled its eyes. When the Tathāgata saw this he felt pity and was pained with sympathy, pained without feeling any joy. Then he returned to the Vulture Peak.

At that time Ānanda spread the sitting mat and the Tathāgata sat down upon it, folding his legs into the lotus posture. Then Ānanda thinking about many things asked the Tathāgata: “Blessed One, in that place over there we saw a worm immersed in a sewage sump. What action did it commit in a former life? How long will it now spend being born into that water? And again, when will it attain liberation?”

The Buddha spoke to Ānanda and the assembly: “It is good that you should ask this question. I shall explain it to you. Ānanda, it goes back incalculable thousands of aeons into the past. At that time a Buddha had appeared in the world, and his teaching had flourished and spread. After he died and entered nirvāṇa, in the time of the Semblance Teaching, there was a brahman, and he built a monastery and supported the monastic community. At one time there was donor who presented a large amount of butter and oil. Then a party of visiting monks arrived. At that time the administrative **karmadāna* [知事維那] became very hateful. He despised the fact that a large number of visiting monks had arrived. So he concealed the butter and oil and would not give them out.

“The visiting monks said: ‘Why do we not receive butter and oil and honey?’ The **karmadāna* answered saying: ‘You are visitors. I have been here since long ago.’ The visiting monks said: ‘This is the donor’s gift to the monks who are present now.’ Then the **karmadāna* got angry and scared, and reviled

¹ T. 156 (III) 141a27-b20.

² Translation uncertain: 惡水.

them saying ‘Why don’t you take the shit and piss [to eat]? Why should you get butter and oil from me?’ And from these evil words, for ninety billion aeons he was always born amidst the sewage water. Through this one evil word, reviling the monastic community in a former life, for incalculable thousands of lives he dwells in the midst of excrement.”

This tale clarifies at least one of the tasks of the administrator, namely, the distribution of food to visiting monks. There are a large number of parallel versions of this same episode, which among other things make it clear that the administrator here is most likely to be understood as a monk.

Probably one of the oldest versions of this story is that in the *Samyuktāgama*.¹ The *Samyuktāgama* version has the present punishment for the offender that he walk along with a copper cauldron filled with fire above the his head, which then pours down (molten copper?) over his body. There is no reference to excrement, and the story gives no direct reason why the present punishment is apposite, the text just mentioning that the administrative monk 知事比丘 refused food to the visitors. There seems to be no similarity posited between refusing food and being bathed in molten metal. In this context we must also note a version in the *Samyutta Nikāya*.² In that episode a man suffers the present punishment of having his body smeared with feces and eating feces because, in the time of the Buddha Kāśyapa when he was a royal teacher and brahman, he invited the community to a meal and served them feces!

The same story appears in the so-called *Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool*.³ According to Lévi and Chavannes,⁴ for the 摩摩諦 of the Chinese text the Tibetan translation has *las byed pa'i dge slong*, a term which we would expect to mean something like

¹ T. 99 (526) (II) 138a1-11.

² SN ii.259,10-18 (XIX,2 §12), equivalent to the Chinese found at T. 99 (526) (II) 137c19-29.

³ T. 202 (IV) 443c26-444b17. The Mongolian translation (from Tibetan) of the *Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool* story is translated into English in Frye 1981: 242-43.

⁴ Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 219.

**karmakara-bhikṣu*. According to Hu-von Hinüber,¹ the as yet unpublished *Poṣadhavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya contains a reference to a *karmakāraka* who is a monk. We apparently also find the same in the *Pravrajyavastu*.²

In another parallel in the 經律異相, the **vihārasvāmin* 寺主 steals a gift of pearls which pious merchants have entrusted to him as a gift to the community.³ When pressed he says “They [the pearls] were given to me. If you want to grab them away from me, I’ll just give shit to you! If you don’t get out of here now, I’ll slice off your hands and feet and throw you into a cesspool.” A very involved and expanded version, with some significant differences but definitely the same story, is found in the *Avadānaśataka*.⁴ There the bad monk is an *āvāsika*, and the words which lead to his punishment are “it would be better for you to smear yourself with excrement!” The Chinese version has the guilty monk as the **vihārasvāmin*, in charge of administering the affairs of the community 寺主營 [or 管] 理僧事.⁵ Feer points to parallels in the Pāli *Jātaka* 41 and *Petavatthu* 43 (IV.8), *Gūthakhādaka-petavatthu* (identical with 44, except for the gender of the protagonist).⁶ In the latter the hungry ghost (*peta*) in the cesspool was apparently a householder who, at the instigation of his resident monk (*āvāsika*), reviled the monks.

Further parallels, or rather near parallels, are also found in the Chinese **Asoka-*

¹ Hu-von Hinüber 1991: 761 note 29.

² Eimer 1983: 135.17-18 (and see Banerjee 1957: 114) has *las byed pa'i dge slong*. At Eimer 1983: 144.12 (Banerjee 1957: 123) and following we find *dge slong las byed pa*. Here this monk is responsible for carrying out the nuts and bolts of the *upasampadā* ordination ceremony. The “karma” being referred to is the same as that in the *karmavācanā*, namely the ecclesiastical “action” of ordination. This discussion is commented upon in Guṇaprabha’s *Vinayasūtra* I.37-49 (Bapat and Gokhale 1982). The term *karmakāraka* there is nowhere qualified by *bhikṣu*, but the context makes it abundantly clear that this is to be understood.

³ T. 2121 (LIII) 258a16-b7, translated in Chavannes 1911: III.283-84.

⁴ *Avadānaśataka* 50: *Jambāla*; Speyer 1906-09: I.279-88; translated in Feer 1891: 190-95. Apparently the same story also appears in the unpublished *Asokāvadānamāla* #17.

⁵ T. 200 (IV) 227c16. According to Demoto 1991, in general the Chinese *Avadānaśataka* is later than and dependent on the *Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool*, a fact which has, according to her, serious implications for the dating of the *Avadānaśataka*.

⁶ Feer 1891: 195.

rājāvadāna and **Asokarājasūtra*.¹ There it is recounted that in an outcaste (*caṇḍāla*) village in Mathura Upagupta and another monk see a young boy covered in abscesses which in turn are filled with worms. Why, asks the monk, is this child who, Upagupta has informed, him is a *srotaāpanna*, suffering so? In a former life the child was a *weina* (see below) in the meditation chamber (? 禪房), and he verbally attacked an arhat-monk who was ill there with abscesses, urging him to leave and go to a *caṇḍāla* village. He repented however, which accounts for his *srotaāpanna* status.²

Similar episodes are found in the Chinese *Samgharakṣitāvadāna*.³ In the time of the Buddha Kāśyapa there was a monk who worked as a **vihārasvāmin* 僧寺主, in charge of the management of the monastery affairs. But he did not admonish the young monks, and they not strike the *gaṇḍī* according to the rule. The vinaya masters then said “why does he cause them to ring the *gaṇḍī* at an inappropriate time?” The monk replied “I am the manager here, and it is a very hard job. You monks are just like sheep, only eating and sleeping. Why don’t you strike [the *gaṇḍī*] yourselves? — And for this reason, he was reborn in hell as a sheep, suffering etc.” In another story the monk who worked as a **vihārasvāmin* appropriates for himself and his friends the best sleeping quarters, not following the precepts but acting according to his own whim and not treating all equally. He also ends up in the appropriate hell.⁴

When we review all of these various versions, we notice the clear implication that the administrator is to be understood as a monk. He is referred to among other things an *āvāsika* or a *vihārasvāmin*. The divergence in terminology which we see here and have seen above confirms the suspicion voiced above that in order to carry out a full investiga-

¹ T. 2042 (L) 124a4-18 and T. 2043 (L) 166b2-29, translated in Przyluski 1923: 385-6.

² Almost identical are T. 2042 (L) 124b25-c10 and T. 2043 (L) 167a21-b15, translated in Przyluski 1923: 388-9.

³ T. 749 (XVII) 569c21-27.

⁴ T. 749 (XVII) 570a4-8.

tion we must widen the terminological scope of our study, and take a look at some other terms for monastic administrative positions. To do this properly would require an entire study unto itself, but a few indications may be offered.

The term *weina* 維那 is explained in Chinese sources as equivalent, usually, to Sanskrit *karmadāna* and as one of three administrative officers, along with 上座 and 寺主. The latter two might reasonably be identified with **sthavira* and **vihārasvāmin*.¹ The Sanskrit term is known to the *Mahāvvyūtpatti*,² but otherwise seems to be extremely rare.³ I have, however, found the same Tibetan equivalent, *las su bsko pa*, in the *Vinayasūtra* of Guṇaprabha, apparently rendering the Sanskrit *karmādāna*.⁴ It is possible that this is the correct form.⁵ Since the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya is the text

¹ See Nakamura 1981: 43bc s.v. *ina*, giving also the equivalent 都維那. See also Oda 1917: 1858c. Numerous other translations and equivalents are found in the latter. The three offices are called 三綱, a term which appears for example in the 大宋僧史略 T. 2126 (LIV) 244c17. See c17-245a25 for a long discussion of these three offices. But note that it would be extremely dangerous to apply any of this to the Indian situation; this is a Chinese text referring to a Chinese context. See Oda 1917: 606c-607a, Mochizuki 1932-36:1503b-1504c.

² Mhy 9362 *las su bsko pa* = *karmadāna*.

³ BHSD does not enter the term, which seems to be unknown to Pāli and Prakrit, according to the dictionaries at my disposal. It is not in Böhtlingk and Roth 1855-75, and Schmidt 1928:137c cites it only from the *Mahāvvyūtpatti*. Other Tibetan-Sanskrit glossaries do not seem to enter the term. Tomomatsu 1931: 278-79 discussed the term 僧執事, which he rendered, on what basis I do not know, with “saṅgha-karmadāna.” I have not seen the latter term attested.

⁴ The Sanskrit text is found in Bapat and Gokhale 1982 and Sankrityayana 1981.

⁵ In the first chapter of the *Vinayasūtra* the term appears twice. In the first instance (I.109) there is no commentary and the sūtra reads *karṭṛtvaṃ karmādānasya*. The Tibetan (Derge Tanjur 4117, ‘dul ba, wu, 4a2) reads *las su bsko ba’i byed pa po nyid do* //. I am not sure, but perhaps this means something like “[the responsibility for assigning the probationer] tasks belongs to the *karmādāna*.” The second passage is remarked upon in the commentary. This sūtra is numbered 389 in Bapat and Gokhale 1982, but 372 in Sankrityayana 1981. The sūtra reads: *nirḍoṣam anāpṛṣṭau gatasya karmādāne apara-tad-āgatau* //. The *vṛtti* has: *karmādānanimittam gatasya aparasya karmādānasya āgamane doṣābhāvo ‘nāpṛṣṭau ity arthaḥ / vibhaṅgād etad śayanāsanaśikṣāpadāt / niśrayaṃ grhṇīta iti vartate* //. The Tibetan text of the sūtra (Derge Tanjur 4117, ‘dul ba, wu, 8b1) reads: *las su bskos par ser ba na de gzhan du byung ba na ma zhus kyang nyes pa med do* //. For the Tibetan I used the computer text data from the Asian Classics Input Project.

Apparently however the term *karmādāna* need not necessarily point to a person. We will see below in a passage from the *Sphuṭārtha Śrīghaṇācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā* of Jayaraksita that the term seems to mean something like “transaction,” and Gregory Schopen has pointed out to me that the term appears also in the *Śayanāsanaṣṭu* (Gnoli 1978: 34.22-23) where the sense may perhaps be something like “full eligibility to take part in monastic actions.”

which Guṇaprabha is summarizing and upon which he is commenting, one might reasonably expect to find the term *karmādāna* therein.

The term *karmadāna* is explained by Yijing as “one who gives others actions.”¹ In any case, in his account of monks who went to India in search of the Buddhist teachings, Yijing gives some interesting information on monastic administration, including references to the *karmadāna*.²

Inside the monastery the eldest is made the *sthavira* and appointed chief, regardless of his merits. Those who have the keys to the gates attach a seal each night, and then hand them over to the *sthavira*. Or without distinction they may give them to the *vihārasvāmin* or *karmadāna*. Only one who constructs the monastery is called *vihārasvāmin* (寺主). Those who stand guard, administer the monastery gates, and announce the business to the community meeting are called *vihārapāla* (護寺). One who sounds the gong or chime (*gaṇḍī* — here probably to summon the monks to meals) and supervises the meals is called *karmadāna* (授事).

The text goes on to specify that it is the responsibility of the *vihārapāla* to bring the community to consensus when there is a matter to be decided. He makes the rounds, stopping before each person individually, and they join their palms together and express their opinion. Consent must be unanimous, and Yijing explicitly states that beating with a switch must never be employed before the assembly to force the offender to consent.³ The role of the *weina* as announcer of meetings and meals and sounder of the *gaṇḍī* is confirmed by the use of the term in the *Aśokāvadāna*. However, in the one place in

¹ T. 2125 (LIV) 226b19-20 = Takakusu 1896: 148-9: 以衆雜事指授於人. The “etymology,” of course is *karma* + *dāna*, “giving actions.” On this and other etymologies, see *Hōbōgirin* s.v. *chiji*, 306b-307a, by Jacques Gernet, and especially T. 2131 (LIV) 1075a5-13. This understanding, by the way, would argue against the reading *karmādāna*.

² T. 2066 (LI) 5c21-27 = Wang 1988: 113 (with notes on p. 124-25), translated at Chavannes 1894: 88-9. Actually the technical terms are given in Chinese (which I have placed in parentheses) and in transcription, so there is no doubt what Sanskrit term is intended for each Chinese term. See Chavannes for a more literal rendering of the passage.

³ T. 2066 (LI) 5c276a2 = Wang 1988: 113-14, translated at Chavannes 1894: 89-90.

which we can correlate this term in the Chinese *Aśokāvadāna* with the Sanskrit version in the *Divyāvadāna*, the Sanskrit term is quite different, namely *udghoṣaka* or “crier, announcer.”¹ Moreover, it seems that at least in some cases the responsibility for sounding the *gaṇḍī* lay with yet another officer, the *upadhivārika*, for instance in the *Avadānaśataka*.² The duties of this latter office are not, once again, entirely clear, but the *Divyāvadāna* does contain a clear reference to the post being filled by a newly ordained monk. The responsibilities of the post as they appear in the *Divyāvadāna* passage consist in taking care of the monastery while the Buddha and the rest of the monks are away.³

Jacques Gernet has offered a detailed discussion of the Chinese term which I have understood as “administrator,” 知事.⁴ From this discussion we can assemble a list of what seem to be the main synonyms, keeping in mind that we cannot be sure to what extent they are actually synonymous: 知事人, 知僧事, 知事比丘, 知事僧, 知院事, 授事, 任事, 營事, 營事比丘, 悅衆. In this context Gernet refers to a passage from the *Mahāratnakūṭa*, the **Nandagarbhāvākraṇṭi*, which is in fact an extract from the Mūla-sarvāstivāda Vinaya *Kṣudrakavastu*, in which the duties of the 知事人 are discussed.

¹ *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell and Neil 1886: 403.5 = Mukhopadhyaya 1963: 100.12; translated in Strong 1983: 264) = T. 2042 (L) 105c9, translated in Przyluski 1923: 266. In T. 2043 (L) 140c6, however, the text has only “monk” 比丘. For other instances of *weina* in these texts, see Przyluski’s indices s.v. *weina* and *karmadāna*.

² *Avadānaśataka* Speyer 1906-09: II.87.2, translated into French in Feer 1891: 324. The passage is not in Chinese T. 200 (IV) 246c. For an excellent discussion of the *gaṇḍī* and its role in the monastic life, see Hu-von Hinüber 1991.

At T. 1442 (XXIII) 650b4-5, it seems that the responsibility for ringing the *gaṇḍī* (to call a meeting to expel unrepentant monks from the community) rests with the 知事人.

³ *Divyāvadāna* Cowell and Neil 1886: 237.16. Obviously based on the context rather than any etymology Zimmer 1925: 21 rendered the term *upadhivārika* with “Torwache.”

For another discussion of the *weina*, this time purporting to list the qualifications for the post (not lustful, angry, fearful deluded, and knowing what is pure and what impure), and the conditions under which it is necessary to appoint a *weina*, see T. 1435 (XXIII) 250b17-c7.

⁴ *Hōbōgirin* 306-8. A very detailed study is given the same term in Mochizuki 1932-36: 3583a-84c. Gernet’s debt to Mochizuki is obvious, though he lets it pass unmentioned.

The Tibetan translation of the **Nandagarbhāvrānti* understands the term equivalent to 知事人 as **vihārapāla* (*khang skyong*).¹ It is said that the **vihārapāla* is responsible for administering (*zhal ta bya* = **vaiyāprtya*) what needs to be done for the community in the monastery:

When the monks go out to beg for alms, sweeping the interior of the monastery he should sprinkle it down. Taking fresh ox dung he should smoothly and evenly smear it (on the ground). Concentrating his mind he must protect (the monastery) and assure that there is no loss or damage. If he needs advice, he should ask the community. If there are incense and flowers, he should hand them out to the community. At night he should close the gates, and at dawn he should open them. He must always wash and wipe down the privy and toilet area. If the monastery has any damage, he should repair it.

Here again it is not entirely clear that this should be understood as *necessarily* a monastic post. The context, however, has the newly ordained Nanda undertaking this responsibility, so it is at least possible for a monk to do it, even if we cannot rule out in this instance the possibility that a layman also could fulfill this role. It is, on the other hand, not a responsibility which requires experience or seniority in the monastic community. It is fair to say that we should not confuse the *vihārapāla* described in this passage with any sort of “supervisory” monk.

¹ The Chinese **Nandagarbhāvrānti* passage is at T. 310 (XI) 326c23-27a3 = Chinese Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya *Kṣudrakavastu* T. 1451 (XXIV) 251b25-c5. The Tibetan text of the **Nandagarbhāvrānti* is found at P wi 249b5-250a2; sTog ga 390b1-7, Derge 57, ga, 207a2-7. The whole passage reads: *kun dga' bo khyod song la dga' bo de la khang skyong byos shig par sgo* [P bsgos, D bsgo] *zhig / des kyang de bzhin du de'i thad du song nas / bcom ldan 'das kyis khang skyong byos shig par bka' stsal to // zhes bsgo ba dang / des kyang khang skyong zhes bya ba ji lta bu / des bya ba ni ci zhig byed ces dris so // des smras pa / gtsug lag khang du dge 'dun gyi bya ba dag zhal ta bya dgos so // smras pa / tshul ji lta pur* [P bu, D bur] *bya ba'i rigs / smras pa / khang skyong zhes bya ba ni gal te dge slong rnams bsod snyoms la dong na gtsug lag khang gi nang gi sa rnams phyags nas chag chag gdab par bya'o // ba lang gi lci ba sar pa blangs nas go rims bzhin du 'jam por bsku bar bya'o // legs par yid la byas te bsrung zhing stor rlag med par bya'o // gros su bya ba yod na dge 'dun la gsol bar bya'o // dri dang me tog yod na dge 'dun la brim par bya'o // mtshan mo sgo gcod cing nam nangs na dbye bar bya'o // snam phyis dang chab khungs rtag tu bkru zhing byi dor bya dgos so // gal te gtsug lag khang zhig cing ral pa yod na bcos legs bya'o zhes de skad bstan pa thos pa dang / btsun pa kun dga' bo bcom ldan 'das kyis ji skad bka' stsal pa bzhin du thams cad bdag gis de bzhin du bgyi'o zhes khas blangs so //*

So far we have looked at terms more or less in isolation, selecting them in what a critic might call an ad hoc manner. But some texts do present us with lists of terms, even if they often do not contextualize these terms to our satisfaction. In the *Ugradattapari-prcchā* we find a list of, for lack of a better term, “vocations” of monks. There is considerable difference between the lists found in different versions of the sūtra, but the Tibetan version has the following: **bahuśrūtya, dharmabhāṇaka, vinayadhara, māṭṛkādhara, bodhisattvapiṭakadhara, āraṇyaka, pañḍapātika, pāṃśukūlika, alpeccha, samtuṣṭa, pravivikta, yogācāra, dhyānin, bodhisattvayānika, navakarmika, vaiyāprītyakara, and dpon sna byed pa*. The clearest Chinese version, that of Saṅghavarman, has fewer entries, but ends by following 坐禪者 = **dhyānin* with 營事 and 寺主.¹ The Sanskrit equivalents for the latter two terms are not necessarily clear, but might be something like **vaiyāprītyakara* and **vihārasvāmin*. It is clear that this list is, if not totally heterogeneous, at least not organized solely according to any principle of administrative duties or roles. While it would be possible to say that the first eight designations, *bahuśrūtya* through *pāṃśukūlika*, refer to “specializations” of monastic practice, the next three terms clearly belong to a different logical type. Of the remaining six items, at least *bodhisattvayānika* and *dpon sna byed pa* must remain highly problematic. I have discussed the term *yogācāra* at length already, and we will discuss the term *navakarmika* below.

An in some ways similar list of “vocations” is again found in the *Abhisamācārikā*,

¹ The Tibetan is found at Peking zhi 317b5-7 = sTog ca 28a7-b3, Derge nga, 274a5-7, the Chinese at T. 310 (19) (XI) 477a1-4. A very helpful comparative list of the three Chinese translations of the sūtra, the quotation in the **Daśabhūmivibhāṣā*, and the Tibetan translation is found in Shizutani 1957: 433-34 = 1974: 368-69, and Hirakawa 1968: 531-32 = 1990: 130-1. The text is translated in Sakurabe 1974: 278, and Schuster 1976: I.225-7. Hirakawa has translated *dpon* [misprinted in the 1990 edition as *dbon*] *sna byed pa* with 觀化者, and Sakurabe with 僧院の主管なる比丘. Hirakawa has perhaps just adopted as his “translation” the last item in the **Daśabhūmivibhāṣā* list, but the correspondence between that list and those in other versions of the sūtra is not straightforward. As far as I can see, there is no equivalent in the **Daśabhūmivibhāṣā* list for *navakarmika* or *vaiyāprītyakara*, the next to last item being 坐禪者 = **dhyānin*, but for instance the 12 *dhutaṅga* practices are individually listed. Sakurabe’s translation might be right, but the Tibetan literally means “the one in charge of various tasks.”

a section of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, in which monks who want to be excused from work appeal on the following grounds:¹

The Blessed One said: “All must behave like this with regard to beds and sitting mats.” What, then, [does it mean]: “All must behave like this with regard to beds and sitting mats”? Now, these vihāras are torn apart, in bad shape, dirty, in disrepair. And then the *gaṇḍī* having been struck with a “clang clang” sound, the entire community must gather. Then someone said: “I am a dharma-preacher, I am an upholder of the Vinaya, I am a wilderness dweller, I am an alms beggar, I am a wearer of refuse rag robes.”² These contemptible little śramaṇas will do the work.” [Speaking in that way] they commit an infraction of the discipline.

This list includes items parallel only to the first set of terms listed in the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*.

The final term apparently related to the issue of administration that we encountered in the list from the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* is *navakarmika*. In the *Jātakamāla* XIX.21ab we find the expression *āvāsikaḥ so 'stu mahāvihāre kacaṅgalāyām navakarmikaś ca*, which Khoroché rendered “may he be caretaker and surveyor of the fabric in the great monastery at Kacaṅgalā.”³ Almost one hundred years ago Speyer had, perhaps more correctly, translated “have his residence in the Great Monastery, entrusted

¹ Jinananda 1969: 653-9: *bhagavān āha tena hi evaṃ sarvehi śeṣyāsane pratipadyitavyaṃ / kin ti dāni evaṃ hi sarvehi śeṣyāsane pratipadyitavyaṃ / ete dāni vihārakā bhavanti odriṇṇakā paluggakā ācaukṣā apratisaṃskṛtā / tato raṇaraṇāye gaṇḍīm āhaṇiya sarvasaṃghena sannipatitavyaṃ / atha dāni kaścid āha / ahaṇ dharmakathiko ahaṇ vinayadharo ahaṇ āraṇyako piṇḍacāriko pāmsukuliko ete dāni śramaṇakā te pratisaṃskariṣyanti / te vināyātikramam āsādayanti /*. At Jinananda 1969: 217.2-3 we find the reported readings *odviṇḍakā* (emended by the editor to *odriṇṇakā*) and *palurgakā*. I am aware that the edition of Jinananda has been critiqued as highly inaccurate, but lacking any alternative I refer to and quote it as is. It should be kept in mind, however, that any given reading is more than usually suspect in this edition. Perhaps *odriṇṇakā* is to be connected somehow with Sanskrit *avaḍḍī* (ppp. *avadirṇa*; note the Pāli form *odarṇa*). We may place *paluggakā* into some sort of relation with *phalgu*, perhaps, and *ācaukṣā* should probably be connected with *acokṣa*. The word *raṇaraṇāye* is an onomatopoeia. I am grateful to Madhav Deshpande for his remarks on these words.

² The Chinese translation T. 1425 (XXII) 504a9-10 has this portion as follows: “I am a forest dweller, alms beggar, 大德(=?), **sthavira* (上座).”

³ Khoroché 1989: 124.

with the charge of the reparation in (the town of) Kakaṅgalā.”¹ There is a Pāli parallel to this verse in the *Jātaka* which has been translated “The great Kajaṅgal cloister be his care, and may he set the ruins in repair.”² With regard to the technical terms found here, *āvāsika* means resident monk, not as Khoroché has it a “caretaker,” and *navakarmika* probably essentially means, counter Edgerton, one in charge of repairs.³ It is not clear to me what Khoroché’s “surveyor of the fabric” means. In a list in the *Bhaisjyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya we find, without specification, two types of monks listed as *upadhivārika* and *navakarmika*.⁴ According to Njammasch,⁵ inscriptional evidence shows that the post of *navakarmika* could be filled by either lay people or by monks.

Another example of the use of the term *navakarmika* comes from the *Rāṣṭrapāla-pariprcchā*, in which future bad monks are criticized in the following terms:⁶

Abandoning meditational trance as well as study, they work constantly as functionaries carrying out the monastery’s affairs. Greedy for sitting mats,

¹ Speyer 1895: 161.

² The text is in *Jātaka* §488, iv.310,13-14: *āvāsiko hotu mahāvihāre navakammiko hotu kajaṅgalāyaṃ*. The translation in Cowell et al. iv.196.

³ I do not think there is any evidence for the suggestion, BHSD s.v. *navakarmika*, that the term means “(one who performs) new-initiate’s work.”

⁴ Dutt 1939-59: i.249,8. The complete list is *adhvapratiṣṭhāna, bhaktacchinna, glānaka, upadhivārika* and *navakarmika*. That is, five types of people should eat a weekly rice ball: a traveller, a starving person, a sick person, plus our two terms, the sense of which is not completely clear.

⁵ Njammasch 1974: 290. Matsuda 1983: 125 is of the opinion that the same is true of the *veyyāvaccā*.

⁶ Finot 1901: 31.1-12:

*dhyānaṃ tathādhyānaṃ tyaktvā nitya vihāra karmaṇi niyuktāḥ /
āvāśagrāhā bhṛkūṭikāś te ca adāntaśiṣyaparivārāḥ //
navakarmiko hy ahaṃ vihāre ātmanahetur eṣa hi kṛto me /
ye bhikṣavo mamānukūlās teṣv avakāśam asti hi vihāre //
ye śīlavanta guṇavanto dharmadharā janārtham abhiyuktāḥ /
damasanyame satata yuktāḥ saṃgraha teṣu te na kurute ca //
layanam mamaitad uddiṣṭam sārḍhavihāriṇo 'pi ca mamedam /
saṃmodikasya ca mamedam gaccha na te 'sti vāsa iha kaścit //
śayyāsanam nikhiladattam bhikṣavaḥ sthāpitā iha prabhūtāḥ /
na ca lābhasambhava ihāsti kiṃ paribhokṣyase 'tra vraja bhikṣo //
śayyāsanoddīśana teṣāṃ naiva bhaviṣyate 'pi ca kadācit /
grhisamcayāś ca bhavitāras te ca prabhūtabhāṇḍaparivārāḥ //*

frowning, they are surrounded by undisciplined disciples. [They say] “I am the building supervisor here in this monastery; I built it for myself. There is room in this monastery for those monks who are faithful to me.” To those who are precept keepers, full of virtue, upholding the teaching, devoted to the welfare of the people, always intent on controlling and restraining themselves, they give no friendly attention. [They say] “This cave-cell is designated as mine, and this one for my fellow practitioner, and this one for my companion. Get out! There is no dwelling here for you. The sitting mats and bedding are completely given out, many monks are already staying here, and there is no possibility to obtain any possessions here. What will you eat here? Get out, monk!” There will never be any request [to the community] for sitting mats and bedding from them [because they will take them at their leisure]. Storing up things like householders, they will have numerous items of merchandise, and numerous followers.

Beyond the implication that the *navakarmika* was responsible for constructing the monastery in the first place (and even that is not sure from this passage), there is really little other specification here of the duties or position designated by the title. It seems likely, however, that the term refers to some monastic position, since the entire passage is discussing monks. A final passage in this regard is found in the **Sarvāstivāda Vinaya-mātrkā*.¹ There it is stated that since the six (evil) monks were the administrators 知事 they had not repaired the monastery and it had fallen into disrepair. I do not know if 知事 can translate *navakarmika*, however.

The Pāli Vinaya contains detailed information on several types of offices or assignments, for example in the *Mahāvagga* where the list begins with the monk in charge of accepting material to be used for robes, and continues with other tasks.² Several Pāli sources give a list of various offices, those in charge of meals, lodgings, the storeroom, reception of robes, distribution of robes, congey, fruit, solid food, trifles, outer

¹ T. 1441 (XXIII) 600a16-26.

² *Mahāvagga* VIII.5ff. = Vin i.283, 15ff.

robes, and most important for us perhaps, the supervision of *ārāṃikas* and of *sāmaṇeras* (*ārāṃikapesa*, *sāmaṇerapesa*).¹ A different list of 20 “vocations” or administrative responsibilities is found in the *Mahāvīyūtpatti*.² The various lists in Chinese Vinaya texts have been studied by Matsuda, and his data and tables well illustrate the diversity of these materials.³

Again in the Pāli Vinaya, we also find a passage in which the responsibilities of one Dabba Mallaputta are laid out, and it is explained that he is in charge of the assignment of lodging.⁴ In another version of the story of Dabba Mallaputta it is said that he is always engaged in administering the affairs of the community 恒營僧事, and he is called by the Buddha the first among administrators 佛說營事第一.⁵ When we turn to the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya, however, we get a more detailed discussion. There we read the following:⁶

... At that time there was a monk named Dabba Mallaputta / Dravya Mallaputra, entreated by the community of monks to control the nine affairs 衆僧拜典知九事. The nine affairs are: 1) to administer the assignment of sitting and sleeping mats, 2) to administer the orderly assembly for meals, 3) to administer the distribution of living quarters, 4) to administer the distribution of robes, 5) to administer the distribution of flowers and incense, 6) to administer the distribution of the fruits of trees and grasses, 7) to administer those in charge of [producing] hot water [for baths?], 8) to administer the distribution of assorted foods, 9) to administer as he wishes the assignment to people of the responsibility for tasks. This is called being entreated by the monks to control the nine affairs. When he

¹ *Cullavagga* VI.21 = Vin ii.175,37-177,24, AN iii.274,15-275,17. See Matsuda 1983: 116-19.

² *Mahāvīyūtpatti* 9056-75. Compare the passage in the *Śāyanāsanavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, Gnoli 1978: 55.22-56.1.

³ Matsuda 1983: 119-22, with a table on 123.

⁴ Vin iii.158,27-160,13 = Sāṅghādisesa VIII.2-4.

⁵ 雜寶藏經 T. 203 (IV) 457a5-29. In the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya T. 1428 (XXII) 587a25ff, Dravya Mallaputra desires to use his insubstantial body in a way that will assure him of substantiality: 此身不牢固。我今當以力方便求牢固法耶。 On the latter expression see the notes to the translation in section V.17.

⁶ T. 1425 (XXII) 280a19-b3. See on this Tomomatsu 1965: 84-85, and more generally for this and parallel versions pages 83-92.

assigns the sitting and sleeping mats this Venerable¹ with the small finger of his right hand sends forth a light. [Using that beam of light as a pointer to indicate the assignment of quarters,] in order he assigns a living chamber to wilderness dwellers together with wilderness dweller. To alms beggars together with alms beggars. To wearers of rag robes together with wearers of rag robes. To those who eat in one sitting together with those who eat in one sitting. To those who sleep in a sitting posture together with those who sleep in a sitting posture. To those who live in the open air together with those who live in the open air. To those who sit upon scattered grass (?) together with those who sit upon scattered grass. To those who recite sūtras together with those who recite sūtras. To dharma masters together with dharma masters. To those who study the vinaya together with those who study the vinaya. (To srotaāpannas together with srotaāpannas. To sakṛdāgāmins together with sakṛdāgāmins. To anāgāmins together with anāgāmins.)² To arhats together with arhats. To possessors of the three knowledges together with possessors of the three knowledges. To possessors of the six superknowledges together with possessors of the six super knowledges. And to those who do not observe correctly the four modes of behavior together with those who do not observe correctly the four modes of behavior.³

Here again we see that not only are the administrative tasks listed but another, seemingly highly heterogeneous, list of “monastic specializations” is also found.⁴

Probably the most detailed and careful Western language study on the type of issue with which we are struggling here is that of Lévi and Chavannes,⁵ an investigation centered on the elusive term 摩摩諦.⁶ The authors begin by pointing out that in the Pāli

¹ The text from here on is compared to its recapitulation at T. 1425 (XXII) 394c9-14.

² The material in parentheses is skipped by the reprise.

³ Note the application here of the *dhutaṅgas*. This passage has been paraphrased and discussed by Tomomatsu 1965: 84-85.

⁴ I say that these lists *seem* heterogeneous because this may mean only that I have failed to detect the operative organizing principle, not that none exists.

⁵ Lévi and Chavannes 1915.

⁶ This paper has, however, been virtually ignored as far as I can tell by almost everyone, including Japanese scholars who are the ones most likely to have investigated such issues. No references to the study in Gernet 1956 or Hirakawa 1970, 1989, 1990, etc., have come to my notice.

Vinaya we find the expression *bhikkhu āvāsiko ... tantibaddho*.¹ Horner has translated: "...a monk ... was a resident there, he was attached to the tradition." As Lévi and Chavannes point out, the first term *āvāsika* is not problematic: it refers to a monk who dwells permanently in a certain place, as opposed to a nomadic or wandering monk.² Both the first English translators, Oldenberg and Rhys Davids, and then more recently Horner have understood *tantibaddho* with Buddhaghosa, interpreting, as Horner translates, "he was fettered by the *tanti* (tradition, sacred text, thread, string) of things to be done (duties, obligations) in that residence." The Sarvāstivāda Vinaya renders the expression with 比丘...作摩摩諦帝帝陀羅.³ The authors go on to quote other examples in Chinese translations which support the equivalence 摩摩諦 = *āvāsika*.⁴ A bit of a hint concerning the functions of this office is given by a passage in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya in which it is at least implied that the responsibility for taking care of visiting monks is that of the, as the text says, 摩摩諦帝帝陀羅僧房主, the **āvāsika tithidhara* [?] master of the monastery.⁵ I use the question mark to indicate the uncertainty over the meaning of 帝帝陀羅.

Lévi and Chavannes quote two vignettes from the *Samyuktāgama* in which someone suffers in his present existence because of misbehavior as a 摩摩諦 in his past life.⁶ The second episode is not clear, but in the first it is possible that the 摩摩諦 may

¹ *Mahāvagga* IX.1.1 = Vin. i.312,6 = Horner 4.446.

² CPD s.v. *āvāsika*: "living in, residing at home, in (regular or permanent) residence, usually of a *bhikkhu* (opp. *āgantuka*); a resident (*bhikkhu*), staying at his (own) monastery and (or) tending it; incumbent of a *vihāra*."

³ T. 1435 (XXIII) 218a17-18.

⁴ But note for example 大宋僧史略 T. 2126 (LIV) 244c18-19, at which the equivalence 摩摩諦 = **vihārasvāmin* is given: 梵語摩摩諦。悉替那。羯磨那陀 [? misprint? should be 陀那]。華言言。寺主上座悅衆也。 That is, 摩摩諦 = 寺主, 悉替那 = 上座, and 羯磨那陀 = 悅衆。 There is no evidence that the "equivalent" which some authors sometimes cite, **mamati*, actually exists at all. This form is based on the assumption that the Chinese is a transcription which can be reconstructed. To be sure, the Chinese 摩摩諦 *could* stand for something like **mamati*, if the latter really existed.

⁵ T. 1435 (XXIII) 224b9-10, 18.

⁶ Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 198-200, translating *Samyuktāgama* T. 99 (532 and 533) (II) 138c11-

be a figure of some administrative authority, since he suggests that monks leave the monastery and go elsewhere.

In a discussion in an early Chinese text attributed (almost certainly wrongly) to An Shigao,¹ the 大比丘三千威儀, concerning the duties of the office designated with another apparently related but also difficult term, 摩波利, fifteen virtues are listed. These virtues are to:

- 1: Work for Buddha. 2: Work for the Dharma. 3: Work for the community of monks. 4: Be frugal with the goods of the community. 5: Be frugal with the goods of the universal community. 6: Be frugal with the goods of individual monks. 7: Take care of the affairs of the Buddha. 8: Take care of the affairs of the universal community. 9: Take care of the affairs of individual monks. 10: Not take the goods which belong to the stūpa and apply them among the goods of the universal community. 11: Not take the goods which belong to the stūpa and apply them among the goods of the community of monks. 12: Not take the goods of the universal community and apply them among the goods of the stūpa. 13: Not take the goods of the universal community and apply them among the goods of the community of monks. 14: Not take the goods of the community of monks and apply them among the goods of the stūpa. 15: Not take the goods of the community of monks and apply them among the goods of the universal community.²

For the 摩摩諦 a very similar list is given a bit later in the same text:

- 1: [The 摩摩諦] does not take the goods of the universal community to apply them as the goods of the stūpa. 2: He does not take the goods of the universal community to apply them as goods of an individual monk. 3: He does not take the goods of the stūpa to apply them as goods of the universal community. 4: He does not take the goods of the stūpa to apply them as goods of the community of monks. 5: He does not take the goods of the community of monks to apply them as the goods of the stūpa. 6: He does not take the goods of the

139a6.

¹ See Hirakawa 1970: 193. Hirakawa believes the text belongs to the period 334-417 C.E. (See also Shio 1931: 149.)

² T. 1470 (XXIV) 922a8-17. See the translation in Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 213.

community of monks to apply them as the goods of the universal community.¹

It is clear that although the exact identification of the relevant Indic technical terms is far from clear, there are close similarities here to the tasks for which the *vaiyā-prtyakara* has responsibility. On the other hand, all of this has reinforced the impression of a great deal of flexibility in terminology. We seem to be left then, at least for the present, doubly unsure: we are unsure about the difference between different terms which seem to refer to similar positions, and at the same time we are unsure of the exact reference of these terms individually. Together this leaves us with a fair amount of data, and precious little that we can firmly conclude from that data.

The Vinaya traditions of Mainstream Buddhism, then, know various lists of monastic offices, the number of distinctions varying with the source. It is still, at this stage in our research, unsure whether these distinctions point to sectarian usages, or whether there is some other explanation such as the influence of geographical or chronological variations. One possibility is that the number and names of various offices increased over time. No matter what one thinks about the process by which the Vinayas took shape through the years, it is easy to imagine that the number of differentiated tasks and assignments gradually grew as new jobs came into being, and others were narrowed through specialization. But this may not be the only or even the predominant cause of the diversity we have seen.

It might be useful to make and maintain a distinction between jobs for the sake of the community at large and jobs which put one in charge of other monks. In other words, being responsible for goods may be typologically differentiable from being in charge of people. As I have said, however, it is not my intention to comprehensively survey the available materials on this topic, as interesting as this would certainly be. Rather we are

¹ T. 1470 (XXIV) 924a15-19. See the translation in Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 216.

trying here to determine the range of possible responsibilities which fall under the domain of the “job description” *vaiyāpṛtyakara*.

In this regard, a reading of the fourth chapter of the *Ratnarāṣi* makes it clear that the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is responsible not only for the well-being of the monks practicing under his protection, but also for at least some of the fiscal administration of the entire community. It may be practical, first of all, to make a legal distinction here between the monastic community on the one hand and the *stūpa* on the other. The tradition itself implies roughly such a distinction when it talks about property: *sāṃghika*, *stāupika* and *paudgalika* or community, *stūpa* and personal property are distinguished.¹ On the other hand, in terms of administration, since the universal community and the *stūpa* are ideal constructs and not living entities — as much as they may be considered “living” in some legal senses, *pace* Schopen² — it is possible for actual administration and supervision to be carried out only by actual humans, be they monks or laymen, and not by the inanimate *stūpa* or corporate community. The *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, at least in the tradition of the *Ratnarāṣi*, is the agent responsible for looking after the well-being and rights of the three relevant legal entities, the local community, the universal community, and the *stūpa*. Different sectarian traditions seem to require different relative treatments of the goods belonging to these three. On the basis of Pāli and Chinese Nikāya and Āgama materials, at any rate, it seems that the positions of responsibility for the assignment of lodging, distribution of food, and distribution of robes are the most essential and central posts in the monastic administration, and specific responsibility for people as opposed to things is not a prominent feature of these accounts. This may imply a certain stage of develop-

¹ Even in the sūtra literature this is evident. The *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā* Finot 1901: 29.8 criticizes the confusion of these three types of property: *stāupika saṃghikaṃ hy api ca vittaṃ paudgalikaṃ ca tac ca samam eṣāṃ*.

² See Schopen 1990.

ment and organization of the monastic community, but it would require a much more careful examination of the vinaya materials before any generalizations might be offered in this respect. Nevertheless, we find in the *Ratnarāṣi* that many of these responsibilities seem to be subsumed under one heading, that of *vaiyāpṛtyakara*.

It has been suggested that the distinction in the *Ratnarāṣi* between the property of the community, universal and local, on the one hand and that of the stūpa on the other provides a crucial key to understanding the history and even the sectarian identification of the *Ratnarāṣi*. As long ago as 1932, Tomomatsu Entai offered the suggestion that there is a strict differentiation in the ways that different sects of Buddhism treat property and its ownership, and for the next forty years he studied this problem from many aspects.

In a work with the somewhat dry title "A Study of Buddhist Economic Thought," a title which seems to have denied the work the audience it deserves,¹ Tomomatsu gave serious and sustained attention to an investigation of the following hypothesis: all Buddhist literature is permeated through and through with sectarian influence, even the very earliest, and we can trace these sectarian concerns and lineages through that literature especially by studying the way certain *economic* themes are treated.² Those themes upon which Tomomatsu concentrated most of his attentions concern the possession and distribution of material goods in the monastic community. Tomomatsu, more-

¹ Tomomatsu 1932, *Bukkyō Keizai Shisō Kenkyū* 佛教經濟思想研究. Tomomatsu, who studied for some time in France, gave his work the French series title "Travaux et matériaux pour la science sociale du bouddhisme," of which this is "Tome I." The continuation (which carries the series title in Japanese as *Bukkyō Keizai Shisō Kenkyū* 2 and 3; the final volume was never published) has if anything the even less inviting title "The Theory and Practice of Distribution in Buddhism," *Bukkyō ni okeru Bunpai no Riron to Jissai* 佛教に於ける分配の理論と實際. It is unfortunate, but hardly surprising, that scholars primarily interested in doctrine have not looked into these works.

² Tomomatsu 1932: 56-57 goes so far as to say "Buddhist texts seem, on the surface, to be discussing the Buddha, but actually they are treating each school's economic circumstances." 佛典が表面、佛陀をかたてゐるかに見えるけれども、其は實は、各學派の經濟事情を論じてゐるのである。

over, explicitly stated his feeling that sectarian divisions are not limited to the so-called Hīnayāna, but run throughout Mahāyāna literature as well. He proposed, therefore, that rather than talk about “Sectarian Buddhism” we speak of the “sectarianism of Buddhist literature.”¹ Particularly relevant to the present discussion is Tomomatsu’s suggestion that the legal and economic status of stūpas is intimately connected with theories and doctrinal speculations about the nature of the Buddha and about merit. Whether one considers the Buddha to be a member of the monastic community, or somehow outside of and beyond that community, determines not only one’s abstract “buddhology,” but also much more concretely the opinion one will hold concerning the question of how much merit a gift to the stūpa or to the community will provide the donor. For the Mahīśāsakas, for example, the Buddha is wholly a member of the community, and the awakening of the Buddha and of his disciples is the same awakening. According to Tomomatsu there is a direct link between this doctrine and the idea that gifts to the Buddha are equivalent to gifts to the community, and vice versa. Consequently the role of the stūpa as an object of donation seems to have been minimal.² In this regard, Tomomatsu suggested that a passage in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya contains not only a statement of the Mahāsāṅghika view but also a criticism of the Mahīśāsaka.³

If a monk is working as abbot,⁴ and the stūpa is lacking property but the monastic community has property, then he might consider as follows: “The offerings made by gods and men to the community of monks are all through the grace of the Buddha. One who makes offerings to the Buddha is then making

¹ Tomomatsu 1932: 26 (佛教文學の部派性).

² See Bareau 1955: 185-86, theses 21 and 22, and also page 188, item 8.

³ Tomomatsu 1932: 108. 摩訶僧祇律 T. 1425 (XXII) 251c22-252a1: 若比丘作摩摩帝。塔無物。衆僧有物。便作是念。天人所以供養衆僧者。皆蒙佛恩。供養佛者。便爲供養衆僧。即持僧物修治塔者。此摩摩帝。得波羅夷。若塔有物。衆僧無物。便作是念。供養僧者。佛亦在其中。便持塔物供養衆僧摩摩帝用者得波羅夷。若塔無物。僧者有物者。得如法貸用。但分明疏記言。某時貸用。某時得當還。若僧無物。塔有物者。得如法貸用亦如是。

⁴ We have here our problematic term 摩摩帝, perhaps *vihārasvāmin*, on which see Lévi & Chavannes 1915: 193.

offerings to the community of monks.” This abbot who [with such reasoning] takes monastic property in order to repair the stūpa is guilty of a *pārājika* offence.

If the stūpa has property but the monastic community is lacking property, he might consider thus: “Offerings are made to the monks, and the Buddha too is among them.” He may then take the stūpa’s property to make offerings to the monastic community. The abbot who utilizes [property so] is guilty of a *pārājika* offence.

If the stūpa has no property and an individual monk has property, it may borrow [the property] and use it according to the rule. But a clear itemization must be made, stating: “At such and such a time [property] was borrowed; at such and such a time it shall be returned.”

If a monk does not have property but the stūpa does have property, he may borrow [the property] and use it according to the rule, and so on as before.

The text then goes on to emphasize the necessity of recording the loan, and so forth. It is interesting to note that the same opinion as that found in this passage is expressed in the *Sphuṭārtha Śrīghanācārasaṃgrahaṭīkā* of Jayarakṣita. This coincidence of views may well lend support to Shimoda’s hypothesis that Jayarakṣita’s text belongs to a Mahāsāṃghika tradition.¹ The relevant passage reads:²

Someone, thinking that as long as worship of the sage, Buddha, Blessed One takes place worshipful reverence of the community is also continuing may,

¹ Shimoda 1987.

² Singh 1983: 79.4-17: *yāvat muner buddhasya bhagavataḥ pūjā kriyate tāvat saṃghasyāpi pūjāsatkāraḥ pravarttate ity evaṃ matvā yāḥ sāmghikam lābham stānyacittena stūpāya dadāti staupikam vā lābham saṃghāya dadāti sa kṣatasamvaro bhavaty ayatir bhavatīty arthaḥ / nanu ca yāḥ kāścit sampadaḥ sarvās tā bhagavantam āgamyati / yonisomanasikāreṇa stānyacittāsambhavaḥ / naitad asti / etad eva hi vidāraṇam stānyacittasyotthāpakam yathā kārunyena salilam apaharata iti / kutas tasyā dattādanam siddhyate / kiṃ punar sāmghikāt kośāt stūpasyo ddhārakam grhītaṃ labhyate / no m-ity āha / likhiveti vistaraḥ / sa[pta]vārikair vā pakṣavārikair vā māsavārikair vā sāmghikāt kośāt likhivoddhārakam grahītavyam / mithaḥ parasparam / stūpāt saṃghasya grahītavyam / saṃghāc ca stūpasyeti arthaḥ / taiś ca vārikaiḥ karmādānaparisamāptau vaktavyam iyat hiraṇyam suvarṇādi staupikāt kośād grhītaṃ sāmghikāc ca iyad iti / noktākṛto nyatheti / katham anyathā / yadi vinā likhivoddhārakam grhṇanti māsaṇīkase ca na vadanti tadā noktākṛto bhavanti / uktam na kurvanti noktākṛto duṣkṛtaṃ prāpnuvantīty arthaḥ //*

My translation is indebted to those in Singh 1983: 170, Derrett 1983: 43, and to the remarks of Shimoda 1987: 939. It is probably good to note here again that the Sanskrit text cannot necessarily be regarded as critically edited.

with the intention of theft, give possessions belonging to the community to the stūpa, or possessions belonging to the stūpa to the community. He [thereby] becomes one whose vows are broken, that is, he becomes a non-ascetic. [To the possible objection:] Is it not so that whatever wealth there is all comes to belong to the Blessed One, and that with correct mental concentration the intention of theft does not arise? [We answer:] No. For this very distinction excites the intention of theft, just as happens with someone who is stealing water with a compassionate intention. Where is theft established in this case? On the other hand, is it permitted to take a share for the stūpa from the stores belonging to the community? No. [The root text says:] “Having written it down” and so on. [This means] the share must be taken from the stores belonging to the community only after the managers for the week, the managers for the half month or the managers for the month have recorded it in writing. [In the verse] “Mutually” means reciprocally. The share for the community must be taken from the stūpa, and the share for the stūpa from the community [reciprocally]. And those managers must say, when the transaction has been completed, “So and so much money, gold and so on, has been taken from the stores belonging to the stūpa, and so and so much from those belonging to the community.” Otherwise [the manager] is one who does not do what was stated. What are the other possibilities? If they take the share without having recorded it in writing, and do not so state at the end of the month, they become those who do not do what was stated. ... They incur a *duṣkṛta* offence.

The same text, again, clarifies that objects such as banners gifted to a stūpa are not to be removed. This is exactly the position of the *Ratnarāṣi* IV.12. The *Śrīghanā-cārasaṃgrahaṇīkā* reads:¹

An ascetic must not take from a stūpa any emblem such as a banner, flag or so on. This formulation implies that the stūpas of the Jainas are also covered here. If one were to take something even from the stūpa of a *paṇḍara* monk (?)

¹ Singh 1983: 82.10-14: *yatinā dhvajāpatākādīlakṣaṇaḥ stūpato na grahītavyaḥ / nirgranthastūpa-grahaṇam copalakṣaṇārtham / tena paṇḍarabhikṣustūpāder api grhṇataḥ syād eva duṣkṛtaṁ na tu saṁvaratyāgaḥ svāmino 'bhavāt / yatra tu stūpe devalakṣaṇe āste tasmād grhṇataḥ syād eva saṁvaratyāgaḥ / anilena vātena tu uddhūtaṁ kāmṣitaṁ pātitaṁ ca yat patākādi tat pāṁśukūlam iti kṛtvā grahītavyam //*

My translation is indebted to that of Derrett 1983: 46.

or others it would entail a *duṣkṛta* offence, but not a total loss of vows, since the stūpa has no owner. When a stūpa has a resident caretaker, one who takes something from that stūpa does indeed incur a total loss of vows [since the violation now is the *pārājika* of theft]. But the flags and so forth that are tossed down, shaken off, or thrown down by the wind should be considered as refuse rags and taken [freely, without implication of theft].

This text differs from the *Ratnarāśi*, however, in that it allows appropriation of items from an ownerless stūpa. The *Ratnarāśi* is quite explicit in stipulating that items once in the possession of a stūpa remain its property and must be permitted to decay on the stūpa. This illustrates well the different standpoints of the *Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā* and the *Ratnarāśi* in regard to this issue. Another *Mahāratnakūṭa* text, the *Vinaya-viṅśaya Upāliparipṛcchā*, makes one of the most serious sins of a monk appropriation of the goods of the stūpa or the community, but does not rank the relative values of these goods as do the *Ratnarāśi* and other texts.¹

A slightly different approach to property seems to be taken by the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya:²

The monks did not know about items which are to be used for worship of the stūpa, items which belong to the universal community, food items, and items which should be shared. What are items which belong to the stūpa, what are items which belong to the universal community, what are food items, and what are items which should be shared? — these things were asked to the Buddha.

The Buddha said: “When giving items, send one monk there to investigate and determine whether this is an item which belongs to the stūpa, an item which

¹ See Python 1973: 35 (text), 101 (translation) (§25): *staupikaṃ vā sāṅghikaṃ vā dravyam apahṛtaṃ syāt hāritaṃ vā hriyamāṇaṃ vānumoditaṃ bhavet*. The passage has been remarked upon in connection with the *Ratnarāśi* by Tomomatsu 1965: 228.

² 十誦律 T. 1435 (XXIII) 352b16-26: 與供養塔物。與四方僧物。與食物與應分物。諸比丘不知。何者是塔物。何者四方僧物。何者食物。何者應分物。是事白佛。佛言。與物時使一比丘在彼立看知分別是塔物。四方僧物。食物。應分物。長老優波離問佛言。世尊。是四種物 塔物。四方僧物。食物。應分物。得錯互用不。佛言。不得。佛語優波離。塔物者不得與四方僧。不得作食。不得分。四方僧者不得作食。不得分。不得作塔。食物者不得分。不得作塔。不得與四方僧。應分物者隨僧用。

belongs to the universal community, a food item or an item which should be shared.”

The elder Upāli asked the Buddha: “Blessed One. May these four types of items, items which belong to the stūpa, items which belong to the universal community, food items, and items which should be shared, be mixed and used together or not?”

The Buddha said: “They may not.”

The Buddha spoke to Upāli: “Items which belong to the stūpa may not be mixed with those of the universal community, they may not be used for food, they may not be shared. Items which belong to the universal community may not be used for food, they may not be shared, and they may not be used to provide for the stūpa. Food items may not be shared, they may not be used to provide for the stūpa and they may not be mixed with those of the universal community. Items which should be shared are to be used in accord with the monks’ [decision].”

The most interesting aspect of Tomomatsu’s analyses for our present concern is his treatment of the Dharmaguptaka materials. The Dharmaguptakas are opposed to the Mahīśāsaka position that the Buddha is just another, equal member of the monastic community, or the Vibhajjavādīn view that he is the head of the community, though still in it (a sort of “first among equals”). The Dharmaguptakas see a distinction between the Buddha and the universal community.¹ The important result of all of this for us is that goods given to the stūpa are held to be inviolable. This is the same reasoning which makes it impossible for others to consume the last meal of the Buddha; what is the Buddha’s can be no one else’s. Tomomatsu goes so far as to say that the rules in the *Ratnarāśī* stipulating the way in which the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* must handle the property of the stūpa suggest that the sūtra, while not a piece of Dharmaguptaka literature per se, is a Mahāyāna text originated from a “sectarian faction” of the Dharmaguptakas or the

¹ Tomomatsu 1932: 201-06. In this context Tomomatsu discussed several problems with the presentation of this issue in the *Samayabhedopacanakakāra*. I do not think the issue has been completely resolved by him, but I am constrained by space from discussing the problem in detail here.

Kāśyapīyas.¹ In fact the Kāśyapīyas are even more radical than the Dharmaguptakas, according to Tomomatsu, insisting for example that a grove gifted to the community be given exclusively to the community, and not jointly to the Buddha and the community as is the case in the parallel account in the Dharmaguptaka literature.²

It should be clear that I think there are a tremendous number of stimulating hypotheses, and a vast amount of exciting data, in Tomomatsu's works. It is not possible to explore this treasure trove in any detail here, although I plan to return to the issue in the near future. And whether we are, in the end, be able to sustain the hypothesis of a Dharmaguptaka origin for the *Ratnarāṣi* or not, we have nevertheless discovered a powerful tool for future research. I think it is very likely that the we will be able to map and compare economic ideologies in Buddhist works just we now map and compare stances on issues of philosophical doctrine. And it might be possible, in fact, to write for this material the sort of book that Bareau wrote for the Abhidharmic materials.³

¹ Tomomatsu 1932: 217: 法護部か、迦葉遺部系の部派の細胞から成立した大乘經典であろうことを想像するにかたくない。By page 344 he is sure that the *Ratnarāṣi* is the product of a Mahāyāna community belonging either to the Dharmaguptakas or the Kāśyapīyas. On page 255 he informs us that by the term 細胞 he intends a translation of Pryzluski's "fraction," that is (in Japanese and French) perhaps even closer to "cell" than "faction," both used in a political sense.

² Tomomatsu 1932: 236.

³ Bareau 1955.

Chapter 7

Final Notes

The present study has, no doubt, not succeeded in actually proving the hypotheses put forward in the first chapter. I did not believe that this would be possible when I began, and I continue to believe that it may never be possible to actually *prove* these hypotheses. On the other hand, I think I have shown convincingly that it is possible to read the *Ratnarāṣi-sūtra* in a manner not at all inconsistent with the stated hypotheses. This constitutes, I would suggest, a sort of circumstantial evidence supporting the utility and imaginative possibilities of the hypotheses, if not their outright truth. I have shown that there is a strong ascetic streak in the *Ratnarāṣi* and related texts, that these texts make efforts to locate themselves, ideologically, within the mainstream of classical Buddhism, and that if anything they often times strive to even more rigorous and unforgiving in their approach than do many examples of Sectarian Buddhist literature.

In what follows I present a copiously annotated translation of the *Ratnarāṣi*, and critical editions of the Tibetan and Chinese translations. In addition to being merely a contribution to our general knowledge of Buddhism, these materials will enable the reader to consider and reconsider my hypotheses and my readings of the text in light of the original sources. I will look forward especially to alternate readings of this material, and to alternative hypotheses regarding the nature and origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism.

SECTION II

Chapter forty-four of the hundred-thousand chapters of the Ārya

Mahāratnakūṭa:

The **Ārya Ratnarāśivvyākaraṇa*

First Bam po.

In Sanskrit: *Ārya Ratnarāśi nāma Mahāyāna-sūtra*

In Tibetan: 'Phags pa rin po che'i phung po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i
mdo

Homage to all Buddhas and Bodhisattvas!

The English Translation: Chapter One

<The Śramaṇa>

I.1

Thus have I heard at one time the Blessed One was staying in Rājagṛha, on the Vulture Peak, together with a great assembly of monks consisting of eight thousand monks, and with sixteen thousand bodhisattvas¹ gathered from various buddhafiels, all of whom were like this: bound to only one more birth before [obtaining] unexcelled perfect awakening,² they had all obtained non-retrogressive tolerance [in the path].³

¹ Chinese adds Mahāsattvas.

² The phrasing in KP §0 is almost identical: “Thus I heard at one time the Blessed One was staying in Rājagṛha, on the Vulture Peak, together with a large group of monks, eight thousand monks, and with sixteen thousand bodhisattvas gathered from various buddhafiels, bound by [only] one [more] birth, that is to say, until unexcelled perfect awakening.” *evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmiṃ samaye bhagavān rājagṛhe viharati sma / gr̥ddhakūṭe parvate mahatā bhikṣusaṃghena sārddham aṣṭābhir bhikṣusahasraiḥ ṣoḍaśabhiḥ ca bodhisattvasahasraiḥ nānābuddhakṣestrasaṃnipatitair ekajātīprabaddhair yad utānutara-syām samyaksambodhau /*. I have translated the opening stock phrase in accord with my understanding of the syntax, or rather of one possible understanding, namely that the specification “at one time” is to be taken with both the verbal expression “heard” and with the verbal expression “was staying.” See Silk 1989.

³ See SP 259.12-13: *gaṅgānādivālukāsamās ca sattvā anuttarāyām samyaksambodhau cittam utpādayiṣyanty avaivartikakṣāntipratilabdḥās ca bhaviṣyanti /*, the last part of which is rendered in Tibetan as *phyir mi ldog pa'i bzod pa yang thob par 'gyur ro //*. Edgerton (BHSD s.v. kṣānti) rendered the expression: “and will become possessed of the intellectual receptivity of non-returners.” But I doubt whether *avaivartika* is a substantive; as far as I can tell, it is used generally as an adjective or attributive. That is, it means “non-retrogressive” (or irreversible), or refers to non-retrogression or the state of non-retrogression, but not directly to those who are in this state, the non-returners. Burnouf 1852: 157 renders it adjectivally: “des créatures en nombre égal à celui des sables du Gange, concevront celle de l'état de Buddha parfaitement accompli, et elles obtiendront la patience qui ne se détourne pas du but.” Lamotte 1975: 120, n. 5 refers to this phrase, which he understands to mean “en possession d'une conviction sans recul.”

It is perhaps unlikely but not completely impossible that we should understand the phrase to mean “the tolerance of [or: which characterizes] the [stage of] non-retrogression,” that is, as a reference to the “Immovable” stage in the Bodhisattva path. (This is usually the eighth, but is the seventh, for example, in the *Avataṃsaka*). The “tolerance of the non-arisal of things,” *anupattikadharmakṣānti*, is the defining characteristic of this stage in the path. On *avaivartika* see Lamotte 1976: 1803-07, Lamotte 1975: 208, n. 209, and Conze 1975: 388ff.

I.2

Then the Reverend Mahākāśyapa spoke thus to the Blessed One: “Blessed One. You often use the word ‘śramaṇa.’ In what sense do you use the word ‘śramaṇa?’”¹ When he had spoken thus, the Blessed One addressed these words to the Reverend Mahākāśyapa: “Kāśyapa, as for the word ‘śramaṇa,’ since [a śramaṇa is]:

- 1) Pacified, and
- 2) Restrained, and

The Chinese of the *Ratnarāṣi* seems to refer to a reading something like **avaivartikair anuttarāyām samyaksambodhau ekajātipratibaddhaiḥ* /. The link here between *avaivartika* and *anuttarasamyaksambodhi* is clear from 於, non-retrogressive “with regard to” *anuttarasamyaksambodhi*.

In the Dbh (Kondō 1.9-10) we find a similar formulation of the opening cliché: *mahatā bodhisattvagaṇeṇa sārddham sarvair avaivartikair ekajātipratibaddhair yad utānuttarāyām samyaksambodhau* /.

Exactly the same expression is found at KP §121: *śramaṇa śramaṇa iti kāśyapa ucyate* / *kiyaṇ nu tāvat kāśyapa śramaṇa śramaṇa ity ucyate* /. Weller 1965: 131 rendered this “Wird . . . ein Religiöser als Religiöser bezeichnet.” The word *śramaṇa* may indeed be intended here as a nominative form, or even perhaps in the example from the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, a case-less stem form (although it could also be a plain nominative, with loss of final sandhi *ś* before *ś*). The only other possibility to imagine would be a vocative, which is to say the least unlikely. Be that as it may, there is certainly no syntactic relation between the two instances of *śramaṇa* (as Weller for instance understood, “x as y”). The argument that we should understand the terms as nominatives can be made on several grounds. Renou 1975 §224 has stated in his discussion of vocatives “En présence de *iti*, la notion d’appel passe en retrait et le nomin. apparaît presque toujours.” See also Speyer 1886 §498 on nominatives with *iti*. We also have a nearly perfect parallel in MN i.271,11 = 281,5: *samaṇā samaṇā ti vo bhikkhave jano sañjānāti*, where it is clear that we have plural nominatives. An interesting interpretation is found in the *Ekottarāgama* parallel T. 125 (49.8) (II) 801c15-16: “All the people refer to you as śramaṇas” 諸人民皆稱汝等爲沙門. (Compare also *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 [182] [I] 724c20.) See also Śikṣ 263.1 = BCAP 588.14-15 *tathatā tathateti kulaputra śūnyatāyā etad adhvācanam*. (We might also point to the constant usage in the *Vajracchedikā* [Schopen 1989b: 103], for instance, of expressions such as: *kṣetravyūhāḥ kṣetravyūhā iti subhūte avyūhās te tathāgatena bhāṣitās tenocyante kṣetravyūhā iti* /.) It is plain that Weller’s understanding is to be rejected, and the repetition attributed to the intention of emphasizing the word. The Sanskrit may be intended to reflect a general statement: people generally use the word ‘śramaṇa,’ and so on, but it seems possible that the Tibetan translators understood the object of the question to be the use of the word by Buddha himself, which they marked with the use of an honorific verb, *bgvi*.

- 3) Noble blooded,¹ and
- 4) One who has purified the constituent elements of morality,² and
- 5) One who knows the entrance into trance,³

I use the word 'śramaṇa;'⁴ and [he is]:

- 6) One who possesses wisdom, and
- 7) One who devotes himself to the heart of liberation,⁵ and
- 8) One who is free from doubt regarding the three doors to liberation, and does not give way to uncertainty,⁶ and
- 9) One who dwells in the realm of the saints,⁷ and

¹ Probably items 1, 2, and 3 are *śānta*, *dānta* and *ājanya*. They occur together in KP §153: *dāntaśāntājāneyakuśalaśilpasuniṣṭhita* [correct from *dāntā*^o with Weller 1965a: 154 (6)]. The Chinese in the *Ratnarāṣi* has translated *ājanya* as 受教, which is not one of the usual renderings and may be based on some understanding of *ā* √ *jñā* as "taught." [Note T. 783 (XVII) 720c4. Kāśyapa says to the Buddha: 世尊。唯然受教, "Blessed One, please instruct me." See also T. 670 (XVI) 513c11.] The standard Tibetan translation is based on a (mis-)understanding of the term as connected with the root √ *jñā* when it renders *cang* (= *ci yang*) *shes pa*. But note that the Dunhuang text of the *Ratnarāṣi* has rendered *bka' nyan*, "obedient." The word has been discussed in detail by Edgerton BHSD s.v. *ājanya*. To this one may add a reference to the remarks of John Brough 1962: 234 (note to GDhp 173), and for the term in Jaina Prakrit one may refer to Caillat 1985. The entries in Wogihara's Sanskrit-Chinese dictionary (1978: 185b) illuminate some possible confusions. Wogihara cites 調, 易調, 調伏, 調順可化, 善順之相 and others, but a glance at his entries for *dānta* (576b), which are remarkably similar, suggests that especially in this case the correct identifications of the Chinese terms with corresponding Sanskrit terms may not always be easy. [Compare also Wogihara 1978 s.v. *karmānya*.] More investigation is necessary.

² **śilaskandhapariśuddha*? See *Aṣṭa* page 805.15 et seq. See BHSD s.v. *skandha* 3, and PTSD s.v. *śīla*. See Mv ii.353.20, and the *Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra*. The term for *śīla-skandha* in Chinese 戒身 is termed "archaic" by Lancaster 1968: 383, who refers to its appearance in T 225 (VIII) 486a27, which corresponds to *Aṣṭa* (Wogihara) 327.8. The term here probably refers to one member of a set: *śīla-skandhaḥ*, *samādhi*^o, *prajñā*^o, *vimukti*^o, and *vimuktijñānadarśana*^o. See Oda 1917: 164c.

³ **samādhipraveśa* (-*praviṣṭa*).

⁴ **śramaṇa iti*

⁵ Chinese, agreeing with the Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript: "One who understands things as they truly are and [so] obtains liberation."

⁶ The expression "does not give way to uncertainty" is missing in Chinese. The technical terms here are probably **kāṅkṣā* and *saṁśaya*. The same Tibetan translation equivalents are found for the two terms at SP 49.1

⁷ **āryagocara*. Chinese: one who is fixed in those practices practiced by the saints / nobles.

- 10) One who dwells in the four applications of mindfulness,¹ and
- 11) One who dwells in the four exertions,² and
- 12) One who has cultivated the cultivation of the four bases of magical power,³ and
- 13) One who possesses the faculty of faith,⁴ and
- 14) One who has indissoluble faith⁵ in the Buddha, and
- 15) One who has indissoluble faith in the Teaching, and
- 16) One who has indissoluble faith in the Saṃgha,⁶ and
- 17) One who, because he knows the Buddha, the Teaching and the Saṃgha, possesses faith,⁷ and
- 18) One who possesses knowledge which acquiescent to others,⁸ and
- 19) One who has put forth effort with respect to good Dharma,⁹ and
- 20) One who has conquered existence, and
- 21) One who is set out,¹⁰ and

¹ **catusmṛtyupasthāna*, or perhaps *catvāri smṛtyupasthānāni*. Chinese instead of “dwell” has “cultivates well.” After this Chinese has another item: “One who is free of all bad dharmas.”

² **catvāri samyakprahāṇāni*. See Gómez and Silk 1989: 87, n. 44, on the term *prahāṇa*.

³ **rddhipāda*

⁴ **śraddhendriya*. Chinese rather than “possesses” has “perfects.”

⁵ **abhedyaprasāda* Mhy. 6824. See Dbh (Kondo 1936: 68.6; Rahder 1926: 38.10-11; verse version at Kondo 75.7; Rahder & Susa 1931-32: 351.7; translation in Tatsuyama 1938: 85 and 93), where the second of the ten qualities which matures wisdom is *triratnābhedyaprasādaniṣṭhāgamanatā*, “the state of arriving at perfection of indissoluble faith in the three jewels.”

⁶ The three items 14, 15, 16 are considered as one in Chinese.

⁷ Chinese: “One who perfects firm faith in...”

⁸ **aparapraṇeya / °pratyaya*. It may also mean “not dependent on others.” Chinese: “One who does not have faith in the teachings of other schools.” Mhy. 2396 has *aparapratyaya* and 2398 *aparapraṇeya*, the Tibetan for both the same. The term *aparapraṇeyatā* appears in the Aṣṭa Mitra 398, Wogihara 788.19-20. See #49, below.

⁹ **vīryam ārabhate*. Chinese: “who endeavors to be free of all defilements.”

¹⁰ **samprasthita*. This probably means “who is set out in the Mahāyāna.” Chinese has for 20-21: “one who well cultivates the seven limbs of awakening and is free of all non-good; in accord with reality he cultivates all good dharmas.”

- 22) Mindful and skillful in [maintaining] constant attention,¹ and
- 23) Of single-pointed mind,² and
- 24) Wise in insight³ due to his wisdom, and
- 25) One who possesses the five powers, and
- 26) One who is not crushed by all the defilements,⁴ and
- 27) One who contemplates⁵ the seven limbs of awakening, and
- 28) One who is wise in knowing the basis of [all] things,⁶ and
- 29) One who knows the path,⁷ and
- 30) One who is wise with regard to the path,⁸ and
- 31) One who has correct views,⁹ and
- 32) One who is correct in meditation,¹⁰ and
- 33) One who is wise in the cultivation of calming and insight,¹¹ and

¹ **smṛta* / *smṛti* and *saṃprajanya* / *saṃprajāna*. The pair of terms is very common in Pāli and Sanskrit. For references see BHSD s.v. *smṛta*, *smṛti*, *smṛtimant*, *saṃprajanya*, *saṃprajāna*.

² Chinese: "one who is single-minded [in attention to] all good dharmas."

³ **vipaśyanā*.

⁴ Mhy. 5199 *anavamardaniya*. See BHSD s.v. Chinese has here "confused" for "crushed." Compare the passage in the *Gaṇḍavyūha* (Suzuki and Idzumi 1949: 430.16-18, quoted also in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 123.4-5): "You, gentle son, should be zealous to make the city of the mind difficult to conquer, difficult to approach, by being uncrushable by all the defilements, the hosts of Māra, evil friends, the circle (?) of Māra." *cittanagaraduryodhanadurāsadatābhinihārāprayuktena te kulaputra bhavitavyam sarva-kleśamāra-kāyikāpāmitramāracakrānavamṛdayatayā*. (Kajiya et al. 1994: II.259, *māracakra* = 魔の軍勢, the hosts of Māra.)

⁵ Chinese: cultivates.

⁶ Basis is probably **āśraya*, and may well mean, with Chinese, "cause." I insert "[all]" also on the basis of the Chinese.

⁷ **mārgajñāna*. Mhy. 1241. One technical definition is given by Yaśomitra, quoted by La Vallée Poussin in *Kośa* vii.13, note 3 (ad VII.8). Compare the expression *mārgāmargeṣu kovida* in Uv. 33.33b = Dhṛp 403, knowing / wise with respect to what is the proper and improper path.

⁸ See Mhy. 441 *mārgavid* = *lam mkhyen pa*. Chinese combines 29-30: "skillful in knowing well the noble path."

⁹ **samyakdṛṣṭi*

¹⁰ **samyaksamādhi*

¹¹ Chinese combines 31-33: "skillful in knowing well correct views and correct meditation." Calming and insight are of course *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*.

- 34) One who possesses knowledge of the four special knowledges not acquiescent to others,¹ and
- 35) One who relies on the meaning and not on the letter,² and
- 36) One who relies on wisdom and not on discursive knowledge and
- 37) One who relies on the sūtras of explicit meaning, and not on the sūtras of implicit meaning, and
- 38) One who relies on the Teaching and not on persons, and
- 39) One who has completely passed beyond the paths of the four Māras,³ and
- 40) The protector who knows well the aggregates (?),⁴ and
- 41) One who has cleared up his defilements,⁵ and
- 42) One who has obtained his final body,⁶ and

¹ “Special knowledges” renders **pratisamvid*. These are the special qualities of a preacher of the teaching: 1) knowing the meaning of what is to be expounded, 2) knowing the text, 3) knowing etymology, and 4) having eloquence. See BHSD s.v. for references, and Childers 1909: 366 for a lucid discussion. Chinese seems to understand this item # 34 causally as follows: “Obtaining the four special knowledges, one does not have faith in other teachings.” See #18 above. I do not really understand “not acquiescent to others.”

² Mhy. 1546: *arthapratisaraṇena bhavitavyaṃ na vyañjanapratisaraṇena*. On this and the following three items, see La Vallée Poussin’s elaborate note in AKB ix.246 n. 2, and for additional references BHSD s.v. *pratisaraṇa*. See also Lamotte 1962: 380, note 23, and 1944-80: 536ff., and notes. The items are, in Mhy. 1548, 1549, 1547: *jñānapratisaraṇena bhavitavyaṃ na vijñānapratisaraṇena*; *nīlārthasūtrapratisaraṇena bhavitavyaṃ na neyārthasūtrapratisaraṇena*; *dharmapratisaraṇena bhavitavyaṃ na pudgalapratisaraṇena*. Chinese has all four items as one item in the list.

³ I think our text corresponds to the terminology found in Gv. 472.15-16: *caturmārapathasamati-krānta*^o. BHSD s.v. *Māra* lists the four Māras as *Kleśa-māra*, *Skandha-*, *Mṛtyu-* and *Devaputra-*. See Childers 1909 s.v. *Māro*, Wayman 1959: 112ff, and more recently Fussman 1977.

⁴ I cannot understand the Tibetan. Chinese has: “One who knows well the five aggregates.” Could Tibetan mean “one who preserves the perfect knowledge of the aggregates”? What would that mean? *yongs su shes pa = parijñā* at Mhy. 6910.

⁵ **(sam)kleśa-apanīta*?

⁶ Although the terminology is a little non-standard, I think we have to do here with the *carama-bhavika*, the final body obtained before awakening. Mhy 7003 gives *carama-bhavika* as equivalent to *srid pa tha ma <la> pa*, whereas the *Ratnarāśi* reads *tha ma’i lus ’dzin pa*. The standard terminology seems to be closer to that of the AKB (Hirakawa 1973: 155), namely *srid pa tha ma pa*. The term has been discussed by Dantinne 1983: 172-74, but I wonder whether his references to the Abhidharmic literature are necessarily relevant. In brief, it appears that the term can refer to either the last body obtained before

- 43) One who has completely passed over the ways of death,¹ and
- 44) One who completely and thoroughly understands suffering,² and
- 45) One who rejects all causes of suffering,³ and
- 46) One who dwells in the realization of the destruction [of suffering],⁴ and
- 47) One who follows the yogic practice of cultivating the path [leading to the destruction of suffering],⁵ and
- 48) One who sees the four noble truths, and
- 49) One who is not acquiescent to others,⁶ and
- 50) One who has done his duty with respect to the Teacher's

buddhahood, or that obtained before arhat-hood. See the references in BHSD s.v. carama-bhavika. Divy 174.1-2 reads: *asthānam anavakāśo yac caramabhavikaḥ sattvo 'samprāpte viśeṣādhigame so 'ntarā kālam kuryāt*. Chen 1947:254, n. 17 renders this "It is impossible that a being in his last state of existence should die before obtaining special attainments." He cites the Tibetan as: *srid pa tha ma pa'i sems can zag pa zad pa ma thob par bar ma dor rgyun chad cing dus byed par 'gyur ba ni gnas ma yin skabs ma yin te*, which he renders "It is impossible for a being in his last state of existence to die and cut off the stream of life before he had obtained the destruction of the āśravas [*sic*]."

¹ **mṛtyupatha-samatikrānta*? Chinese: "free from all the ways of saṃsāra."

² **duḥkham* [samyak?] *parijñātam*. Mhy. 1321 gives only *sdug bsgal yongs su shes* = *duḥkham parijñātam*. Chinese has here: free of all 愛 = *trṣṇā*?

On *parijñā(ta)*, see Tatia 1983. As Tatia points out, the term originally meant "counsel of wisdom" or "discrimination between good and evil." Later it came to mean "abstinence from sinful activities." Depending on the date of a given text and its background, then, the term might imply either understanding of suffering or its removal. In Pāli we find the stock phrase (e.g., SN iv.51,5; v.6,26-27 etc.): *dukkhassa kho āvuso pariññattham bhagavati brahmacariyaṃ vussati*. "Truly, Venerables, one lives carrying out the practice of purity under the Blessed One for the sake of understanding suffering." The rendering of *pariññā* here as "understanding" is supported by *Samyuktāgama* 114 (T. 99 [II] 38b3, parallel to SN iv.51,5, which renders the phrase 我爲知苦故.

³ **sarvasamudayaḥ prahiṇaḥ*. Mhy. 1322 does not include the term "all," **sarva*, but is otherwise identical.

⁴ **nirodhaḥ sākṣātkṛtaḥ*. Mhy. 1323 is a little different. It has 'gog pa mngon du byas = *nirodhaḥ sākṣātkṛtaḥ*. I do not know to what Sanskrit term "dwells," *zhugs pa*, corresponds.

⁵ It is evident from the context that we have here the final member of the formula of the "Four Noble Truths." However, the terminology is non-standard. Mhy 1324 gives *sdug bsgal 'gog pa(r) 'gyur ba'i lam bsgoms* = *duḥkhanirodhagāminīpratipad (bhāvitā)*. The latter part of the phrase in the *Ratnarāṣi* may reflect some form of **yoga-anu*gam or *yoga-anupra*viś. Chinese has combined 44-47 into one item.

⁶ See #18 above, and note.

teachings,¹ and

- 51) One who has done what is to be done,² and
- 52) One who has destroyed the depravities,³ and
- 53) One who contemplates the eight liberations,⁴ and
- 54) One who is greeted by Śakra, Brahmā and the world protectors,⁵
and
- 55) One who has a store of former practice and mental disposition,⁶
and
- 56) One who delights in dwelling in the wilderness,⁷ and
- 57) One who dwells in the saintly attitudes,⁸ and

¹ *śāstuh śāsana ... kṛtakṛtya. See Mhy 2435 and 1082. Here Chinese has evidently divided the Indic original differently. The phrase “with respect to the Teacher’s teachings” is included by Chinese in the previous item: “with respect to the Buddha’s teaching, he does not have faith in other paths.”

² *kṛtakaraṇīyaḥ. Mhy 1083. This item is either not included by Chinese or combined with the preceding item. I do not know what the difference is between kṛtakṛtya and kṛtakaraṇīya.

³ *kṣīṇāsrava.

⁴ *aṣṭavimokṣadhyāyin? SP 180.1 in the edition of Kern and Nanjio is printed as aṣṭavimokṣa-dhyāyinaḥ, with a note that the manuscripts read °vimokṣā°. Edgerton BHSD s.v. vimokṣa rejected the emendation and proposed to read with the manuscripts. However, the printed edition’s °vimokṣa° is also found in the Gilgit text. (Kashgar reads aṣṭavimokṣaprāptāḥ.) KP §83 has na tv evāṣṭavimokṣadhyāyīṣv arhatsū = dgra bcom pa rnam par thar pa brgyad la bsam gtan pa de dag la ma yin no: “while not at all (even) in Arhats who have attained the concentration on the eight liberations.”

⁵ I have not yet tracked down a reference. Chinese has “praised” instead of “greeted” (praty-ud√gam?).

⁶ See SP 46.5, cited by BHSD s.v. sampadā: te āśayasampadāya viśuddharūpāya samanvitā bhūt, translated by Edgerton “they were endowed with a rich store of mental disposition that was pure in form.” Probably the term “former practice” is related to the Sanskrit pūrvacaryā. The LSV §9 verse 7 has sngon gyi spyod pa translating purimacari. Chinese: “one who from the beginning has practiced the way single-mindedly.”

⁷ *aranyavāsābhīrati. In KP §25 the Tibetan translation and the commentary of *Sthiramati read: gus par byas te dgon pa la gnas par mngon par dga’ ba dang, which in the extant Indic text corresponds only to satkṛtyāranyavāsah, without the term abhīrati occurring. The latter (i.e., mngon par dga’ ba) also is absent in the Mahāyānasamgraha quotation of this passage (II.34A.24; Nagao 1982: 104 for the text, translated at 427).

⁸ See KP §6 for āryavaṃsa. The Sanskrit equivalent for the Tibetan and Chinese translations is certain, but the meaning is less clear. See BHSD s.v., and CPD s.v. ariya-vaṃsa. I follow Edgerton BHSD in translating “attitudes,” thought this is far from etymological, since I think this is a good way of describing what the CPD (loc. cit.) calls the “fourfold traditional practices.” These are: being content with the

- 58) One who dwells in the dhuta ascetic purification practices,¹ and
 59) One whose intelligence is free from distortion², and
 60) One who having gone forth does not mix with the home
 dwellers,³ and
 61) One who wanders alone like a rhinoceros,⁴ and
 62) One who is scared by garrulous association with others, and
 63) One who is liberated from the three worlds,⁵ and
 64) One who is always fearfully aware [of the three worlds],⁶ and
 65) One who dwells in the practice of the perfect śramaṇa, and
 66) One who does not desire anything, and
 67) One who is completely free from the eight conditions of the world
 [namely]: gain and non-gain, fame and non-fame, happiness and

robes one has, the alms one receives, the sleeping accommodations one has, and delighting in meditation.

¹ *dhutaṅga.

² Conze 1967 notes that in *Suvikra* (Hikata 1958: 60.2) *gya gyu med pa* represents *akuṭila*; the same is found in the LSV according to Inagaki 1984: 14 (LSV §38d, Kagawa 1984: 296.15). It is also possible we have to do with *a(vi)kampyacitta, as at Mhy. 5198 or Bbh 240.4, 251.1, but this is less likely. Chinese has: “whose mind is not inverted.”

³ Chinese has “does not closely associate with groups of renunciants or householders.” The same idea as that found here in the Tibetan seems to be expressed in the RP 12.16-13.1 (a passage which is in the Han translation): “A bodhisattva, Rāṣṭrapāla, must be disinterested in the home life. Having gone forth, a bodhisattva, Rāṣṭrapāla, must be disinterested in gains and honors.” *grhāvāsād rāṣṭrapāla bodhisatvenāna-peṣeṇa bhavitavyam / pravrajitvā rāṣṭrapāla bodhisatvena lābhasatkārād anapeṣeṇa bhavitavyam /*. For an understanding in line with that taken by the Chinese text, see below I.4 (10, 11), and the note there.

⁴ We have here to do with a famous cliché, discussed by Edgerton BHSD s.v. *khadga-viṣṇa*. See RP 13.7: *ekācārī viharanti khadgavimālāḥ śuddhāśayā nirmalāḥ* = *bse ltar gcig pur gnas shing bsam pa dri med dag la dri ma bral*. (This is quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 196.4 with *sadrśāḥ* in place of *vimāla*.) RP 16.7: “He wanders alone just like a rhinoceros, and moreover is not frightened, just like a lion.” *eka viharati yathaiva khadgo na ca punar uttrasate yathaiva sinhaḥ* = *dper na bse ltar gcig pu gnas byed cing // seng ge lta bur jigs pa yod ma yin //*. Edgerton gives further references to many other passages. As he points out as well, the reference is not to the horn of the animal, though it is a single, as it were lonely, horn, but to the habit of the rhinoceros to wander alone. The Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāsi*, however, renders: “whose mind delights in wandering alone like a rhinoceros horn.” The use of this image in comparisons to the lone buddha, the *pratyekabuddha*, is common.

⁵ Chinese appears to have, corresponding to this: “one delights in dwelling in solitary places.”

⁶ The interpolation in brackets is uncertain and based upon the Chinese, which has: “One is always fearful of the three worlds.”

- suffering, praise and blame,¹ and
- 68) One who dwells having produced² a mind [firm] like the earth,
and
- 69) One who defends self and others, and
- 70) One who is without transgression,³ and
- 71) One who is without mental disturbance,⁴ and
- 72) One who lives rightly, and
- 73) One who dwells having attained a mind [clear and vast] like the
sky,⁵ and
- 74) One whose mind is unobstructed with regard to all appearances, as
for example a hand is unobstructed in the sky.⁶

Kāśyapa, if one possesses such qualities as these, characteristic of a śramaṇa, one may say his a 'śramaṇa.'

¹ The eight *lokadharmāḥ* are given in Mhy. 2341-48: *lābha, alābha, yaśa, ayaśa, nindā, praśaṃsā, sukha, duḥkha*. The same set is found in Pāli, for example DN iii.260,6-7. See *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 180.1-2, quoting the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*: "Again, householder, the householder bodhisattva must be free from attachment and repulsion, unsmear by the eight conditions of the world." *punar aparaṃ grhapate grhīṇā bodhisatvenānūyapratighāpagatena bhavitavyam aṣṭalokadharmānanulīptena*.

² **upa-saṃ*√*hr*.

³ Mhy. 4545 *avyabhicārī*.

⁴ KP §93 *'khrug pa med pa = nirupāyāsa*. BHSD s.v *upāyāsa*. Chinese has for this and the previous item: "who is unstained."

⁵ It is not exactly clear how this comparison of the mind with the sky is to be understood. We find the following comparison at Thag 1156 (trans. Norman 1969): "This mind, well-concentrated inside, is like the sky." *tad ākāśasamaṃ cittam ajjhattam susamāhitam*. Another example is found in KP §99 in which the mind is again compared to the sky, this time in a negative sense: the mind is defiled by adventitious defilements (*āgantukakleśa*) just like the sky is filled with smoke and, as we would say, smog. See also Mori 1987: 254. I follow, nevertheless, Luis Gómez's suggestion that here the comparison indicates the vastness and clarity of an, as it were, endless sky.

⁶ The sky is a common object of comparison for non-obstruction. See Mori 1987: 522-23.

I.3

Then the Reverend Mahākāśyapa spoke thus to the Blessed One: “Blessed One. It is marvellous¹ that these merits of the perfect śramaṇa were taught by the Tathāgata, Arhat, Perfectly Awakened Buddha, Blessed One in this way. Blessed One. In the future will there arise those monks who destroy the Tathāgata’s awakening perfected over uncountable aeons, who are not śramaṇas but will falsely claim to be śramaṇas, who are not followers of the practice of purity but will falsely claim to be followers of the practice of purity?” The Blessed One said: “Kāśyapa, after I and you and also these great auditors have entered final nirvāṇa, and after these bodhisattvas have also dispersed to other buddhafiels,² the complete destruction of this teaching will be indescribable in words.³ Then, Kāśyapa, there will arise some monks who will not contemplate the body, will not contemplate the precepts, will not contemplate the mind, will not contemplate wisdom,⁴ will be poor fools,⁵ imbeciles, confused,⁶ not calmed,⁷ undisci-

¹ The Tibetan has *ngo mthar*, and the Chinese 未曾有. It is impossible to say whether these both go back to one and the same word; they are both good, attested translations of either *adbhuta* or *āścārya*. These words are quite often used together, in both Pāli and Sanskrit literature. See CPD s.v. *abbhuta*, and for example VKN VI §13, 2, quoted in Sanskrit at *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 269.12: ... *iyam dvitīya āścaryādbhuto dharmah* (Tibetan in Ōshika 62,32: *de ni ngo mthar rmad du byung ba’i chos gnyis pa’o*). Anyway, both terms mean more or less the same thing.

² Note that the bodhisattvas do not go to Nirvāṇa, but rather to other buddhafiels to carry on their work.

³ In Chinese the order of clauses differs significantly: “The crime of such a destruction of the Tathāgata’s bodhi is inexhaustible. Kāśyapa. After I enter nirvāṇa and after you and the other great disciples also all enter nirvāṇa, and all the great bodhisattvas of the world go to buddha worlds of other directions, then in my teaching there will be monks who are mentally very confused about all the practices” The following sentences of the section are also found in an order which differs from that in the Tibetan, but this difference does not seem to affect the meaning as much.

⁴ See Pras 6D [ed. and trans. Harrison 1978, 1990] for future monks who “have not cultivated their bodies, not cultivated their minds, not cultivated morality, not cultivated wisdom.” *lus ma bsgoms pa / sems ma bsgoms pa / tshul khrims ma bsgoms pa / shes rab ma bsgoms pa*. In KP §137, *shes rab sgom pa* = *prajñābhāvanā*.

⁵ Chinese has **bāla* as “small child,” Tibetan as “fool.”

⁶ Chinese: “turning into darkness.”

⁷ See Weller 1965: 141 (6), and his reference to the KP commentary (Staël-Holstein 1933): 235.15

plined. I will [now] describe their deceit, guile, dishonesty, intrigues, the impurity of the monk, and the offences of the monk.

I.4

“In that regard, Kāśyapa, what are the impurities of the śramaṇa? The following thirty-two items,¹ Kāśyapa, are the impurities of the śramaṇa,² and if he abandons them one may say he is a ‘śramaṇa.’ What are the thirty-two?

- 1) Focus on physical desire is the impurity of the śramaṇa,³ and
- 2) Focus on malicious thoughts is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁴ and
- 3) Focus on harming [others] is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁵ and
- 4) Praising oneself is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 5) Despising others is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁶ and
- 6) Seeking all around for improper possessions is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 7) The desire [to obtain] a possession [by referring to] possessions [obtained from others] is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁷ and

ff.

¹ Actually, the Tibetan translation has thirty-three items, although the Chinese preserves only thirty-two.

² KP §114 gives two impurities of the renunciant, *pravrajitasya malau*.

³ *kāmaṇitarka*. The series of this and the next two terms appears below in *Ratnarāṣi* V.6. The set is in fact canonical; see, for example, DN iii.226,13 ff., and PTC s.v. *kāmaṇitarka* for further examples. In Sanskrit see *Aṣṭa* quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 39.15 = Mitra 520 = Wogihara 981.10-11: *na kāmaṇitarkam utpādayāmāsa na vyāpādayitarkam na vihiṃsāvitarkam utpādayāmāsa*, and the *Lalitavistara* (Lefmann 1902: 71.8-9): *na ca kāmaṇitarkam vā vyāpādayitarkam vā vihiṃsāvitarkam vā vitarkayati sma*. See also Bbh 145.12ff. (Tatz 1986: 54).

⁴ **vyāpādayitarka*. See BHSD s.v. *vyāpāda*.

⁵ **vihiṃsāvitarka*

⁶ See for this and the previous item KP §1 *ātmoṭkarṣi parapaṃsakaḥ*, “he thinks highly of himself, is a disparager of others.” Mhy 2444, 2445. The two terms are also found together at *Aṣṭa* 184 (Wogihara 403.8-9).

⁷ *lābhena lābhaniścikīrṣā*. Mhy 2456. See BHSD s.v. *niścikīrṣā*, “extraction of a profitable gift

- 8) Squandering gifts of faith is the impurity of the śramaṇa,¹ and
- 9) Concealing one's transgressions is the impurity of the śramaṇa,²
and
- 10) Serving householders is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 11) Serving renunciants is the impurity of the śramaṇa,³ and
- 12) Delighting in garrulous association with others is the impurity of

(from a layman, by a monk) by (referring to) a gift received (from others; one of the 5 mīthyājīva for a monk." Edgerton refers to Wogihara 1930-36: 25-26, which contains a detailed discussion of the term and its etymology.

¹ *śraddhādeyaṃ vinipātayati*, as in KP §9. See in Pāli Vinaya i.298,2. BHSD s.v. *śraddhādeya* refers to Divy 336.27-337.1: *vayaṃ śraddhādeyaṃ vinipātayitvā iha pratyekanarakeṣūpapannāḥ*, "we are here fallen into individual hells, having squandered gifts of faith," and in a following sentence (337.3-4): *māyusmantaḥ śraddhādeyaṃ vinipātayisyatha*, "do not squander gifts of faith!" See below in I.9. At 571.6 we have the Tibetan in Nobel 1955: 33.35-34.1: *śraddhādeyaṃ vinipātya* = *dad pas sbyin par bya ba chud gzan pas*. In his translation and note, Nobel 1955: 91 and (2) interprets the term to mean "consume," "aufzeheren, verbrauchen."

² Mhy 8473): *gnas ngan len 'chab pa* = *duṣṭhulapratichchādanam*. In KP §116, two faults (*vraṇa* = *rma*) of the renunciant are mentioned, one of which is *svadauṣapratichchādanatā* = *bdag gi nyes pa 'chab pa*: "covering over of one's own faults."

³ See above I.2 (60), with the note, at which spot the Chinese of *Ratnarāṣi* seems to have the same intention. SP 287.11-13 also seems to say exactly the same thing: "Once again, Mañjuśrī, the monk who is a bodhisattva, mahāsattva, living when the Tathāgata has passed into nirvāṇa, at the time of the destruction of the true teaching, who wishes to uphold this preaching of the teachings must dwell as far away as he can from householders and renunciants, and must dwell in friendliness." *punar aparaṃ mañjuśrī bodhisatto mahāsattvas tathāgatasya parinirvṛtasya saddharmapratikṣayāntakāle vartamāna imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ dhārayitukāmas tena bhikṣuṇā grhasthapravrajitānām antikād dūreṇa dūraṃ vihartavyaṃ maitrīvihāreṇa ca vihartavyam*. The corresponding expression in the Kashgar manuscript (Toda 1981: 140, 243) of the SP and in Kumārajīva's translation (38c4ff) (the Gilgit manuscript is missing here) expresses an entirely different idea. It is possible that the insertion of this idea into the SP should be considered late.

Another example is found in the *Pañcaviṃśatisatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Dutt 1934: 215.20), in which a list of ten things to be renounced in the fifth bhūmi includes: "Familiarity with householders and renunciants must be renounced." *grhipravrajitasamstavah parivarjitavyah*. See also the **Daśabhūmi-vibhāṣā*: "The bodhisattva who dwells in the wilderness (**āraṇyaka-bodhisattva*) should (first) dwell separating himself from householders and renunciants. [Then continue three more items, elided here]." T. 1521 (XXVI) 114a24: 菩薩住阿練若處者。一遠離在家出家。It seems that the same idea is expressed in the *Mahābhārata* 12.269.16 and in the *Nārada-parivṛājaka Upaniṣad* (Schrader 1912: 183.10, translated in Olivelle 1992: 205): "Let him [= the ascetic] never associate with householders or with hermits." *vānaprasthagrhassthābhyāṃ na saṃsṛjyeta karhicit* /.

Contrast, however, the idea in KP §113: "These two, Kāśyapa, are things which create impediments for a renunciant. Which two? Frequenting those belonging to the group of householders, and hostility toward those belonging to the group of the saints." *dvāv imau kāśyapa pravrajitasyāntarāyako dharmau. katamo dvau. grhapatipakṣaseveṇā ca āryapakṣavidveṣaṇatā*.

- the śramaṇa, and
- 13) The false idea that his possessions are imperfect¹ is the impurity of the śramaṇa,² and
 - 14) Being dissatisfied with his own possessions is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
 - 15) Being jealous of and avaricious toward what others have easily obtained is the impurity of the śramaṇa,³ and
 - 16) Lust for the possessions of others is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
 - 17) Not recognizing his own failings is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁴ and
 - 18) Seeking after the failings of others is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁵ and
 - 19) Not upholding the monastic disciplinary rule and the code of monastic behavior is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁶ and
 - 20) Being noisy like a raven is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁷ and

¹ **apariniṣpanna*.

² Chinese: "creating the means to obtain what one does not yet possess is the"

³ See KP §7 *irṣyāmātsaryam paralābheṣu = gzhan gyi rnyed pa rnams la phrag dog dang / ser sna byed pa*; in the verse *mātsaryam irṣyā paralābha kurvate = gzhan gyi rnyed la ser sna phrag dog byed*. One of the four "crooked inceptions of mind" is "that having jealousy and envy of the acquisitions of others." Items 14 and 15 are reversed in order in the Chinese.

⁴ See KP §24 *ātmaskhaliteṣu doṣadarśanatayā*, "the recognition of the fault in one's own mis-steps." See also Aṣṭa (Mitra 184; Wogihara 403.9) *doṣāntaraprekṣī*.

⁵ See KP §24 *paraskhaliteṣv aruṣṭāpatticodanatayā*, "being without anger or accusation of sin in the mis-steps of others."

⁶ That is, Prātimokṣa and Vinaya.

⁷ Raven, *khwa*, may be *vāyasa* Mhy. 5057, *kāka* 9310 or *dhvāṅkṣa* 4863. *mu cor smra ba* means to talk nonsense, and Mhy. 2481 gives *mukhara*. On the latter, see BHSD s.v. As Edgerton notes, in Sanskrit this means noisy, or garrulous. Thag (Norman 1969, note to 926) Cy ad Thag 955 offers the following definition: *mukharā ti mukha-kharā khara-vādino*, "mukhara means the oral roughness of a rough talker," which while clearly a folk etymology, supports the meaning suggested by Edgerton of impudent or scurrilous. In canonical Pāli the term seems to occur usually in the set phrase *uddhatā unnalā capalā*

- 21) Being disrespectful, haughty and arrogant is the impurity of the śramaṇa,¹ and
- 22) Being ensnared by views is the impurity of the śramaṇa,² and
- 23) Contradicting [the teaching of] dependent co-origination is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 24) Dwelling in extreme views is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 25) Delighting in saṁsāra is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 26) Not delighting in nirvāṇa is the impurity of the śramaṇa,³ and
- 27) Grasping after the ideas of the Materialists is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁴ and

mukharā vikiṇṇavācā. See CPD s.v. *uddhata*, and see the next note. Chinese has here: “not knowing modesty and shame is the”

¹ See the *Ugradattapariprcchā*, quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 120.4 = BCAP 123.9-11, “One must be sober and sane, steady and constant, unperplexed, not loquacious, not arrogant, humble.” *bhavitavyam amattenānunmattenācapalenācañcalenāsambhrāntenāmukhareṇānummadenānuddhatena*°. See La Vallée Poussin’s note in BCAP 123 (3) on *unnaḍa*.

² See Mhy. 862) *nānāḍṣṭṭyanuśayaparyavasthāna*° = *lta ba tha dad pa dang bag la nyal dang kun nas dkris pa*°. See BHSD s.v. *paryavasthāna*.

³ Chinese has Tibetan items 25 and 26 as a single item 26. Item 25 in Chinese is: “Not to be completely calm and not to be free of lust is the”

⁴ See KP §5, 111: *lokāyatanamantraparyeṣṭi* = ‘*jig rten rgyan phan pa’i gsang tshig (yongs su) tshol ba*. According to the commentary of Sthiramati on KP §5 (p. 41), one thinks that through studying worldly literature, and by gaining skills such as facility in debate one will be able to obtain profit and reverence, and thus one loses sight of the true teaching. It is interesting to observe Sthiramati’s comment that the word *lokāyatana* (not *lokāyata*!) is to be explained by the fact that they devote themselves to what is not the domain (*skye mched* = *āyatana*) of good dharma. See also KP §13, 111. I believe that the term Materialists, *lokāyata*, is used in a rather generic sense as a criticism of those not properly concerned with spiritual goals. In the *Pratyutpanna* (Harrison 14B) a condition for the bodhisattva to obtain the *saṁādhi* is (Harrison’s translation) “not relying on the formulae of the other sectarians,” *gzhan mu stegs can gyi gsang tshig la mi rten pa*, and in 16M in order to obtain it the bodhisattva must “not rely on any of the sectarian schools or on any of the sectarians’ formulas,” *mu stegs can gyi skyed mched thams cad dang / mu stegs can gyi sngags thams cad la mi rten pa dang /*.

On the Materialists see Yuyama 1989. (To the voluminous references given by Yuyama one may add the article by Namai 1967. It is gratifying that in his letter of 15 Feb., 1993 Prof. Namai agreed with my understanding of the meaning of *lokāyata* in the KP passage. Namai’s series of articles of which that cited above is the first has continued, reaching at least seven so far.) One might also consult Mori 1982, a study of the *Lokāyata* and *Vitaṇḍavāda* in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās. Note that neither Yuyama 1989 nor Weller 1965: 66 (1) were able to suggest what the meaning of the difficult term *mantra* might be here. Yuyama did however refer to some suggestive passages in the *Laṅkāvatāra*, which will bear further examination.

- 28) Being ensnared by obstructions is the impurity of the śramaṇa,¹
and
- 29) Contradicting [the teachings concerning] the maturation of acts is
the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 30) Being terrified by the three gates of liberation is the impurity of the
śramaṇa, and
- 31) Rejecting the profound teaching is the impurity of the śramaṇa,
and
- 32) Dwelling in opposition to the teaching is the impurity of the
śramaṇa,² and
- 33) Not honoring the Three Jewels is the impurity of the śramaṇa.

Kāśyapa, these thirty-two are the impurities of the śramaṇa, and if he abandons them one may say he is [truly] a ‘śramaṇa.’

I.5

“Kāśyapa, these eight obstruct the qualities [which define a true] śramaṇa³.

Which eight?

¹ Chinese has: “The five *āvaraṇas / *nivarāṇas covering over the mind and producing various defilements is” The five are, in Pāli, *kāmacchando*, *vyāpādo*, *thīnamiddham*, *uddhaccakukkuccam*, and *vicikicchā*, at for example DN i.246,17-18, AN iii.63,14-20, and so on. We find in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 145.8-13 an example of these terms together with what is probably the same verb we have here: *kāmacchandaparyavasthānaduḥkhitānāṃ sattvānāṃ kāmacchandaparavasthānaduḥkham prativinodayati. vyāpādastyānamiddhaudhātayakaukrtyavīcīkṣāparyavasthānaduḥkhitānāṃ sattvānāṃ yāvat paryavasthānāṃ prativinodayati.*

² Chinese has, for 31 and 32: “slandering the profound teaching and not practicing complete calming is the”

³ Based on the extant Sanskrit from the end of this section, we know that this phrase must be: **ime kāśyapa aṣṭau śramaṇadharmāvaraṇās.*

- 1) Not honoring one's mentors.¹
- 2) Not reverencing the teachings.²
- 3) Engaging in incorrect thinking.³
- 4) Rejecting sūtras one has not learnt [oneself].⁴
- 5) Being terrified by the doctrine [that there is] no self, no living being, no life-force, no person.⁵
- 6) Not comprehending the teaching about unconditioned things, but pursuing only the conditioned.⁶
- 7) Being terrified when one hears that conditioned things are

¹ This is hardly a satisfactory rendering for *bla ma* = *guru*. But I have failed to find an acceptable alternative. To leave Sanskrit *guru* or Tibetan "lama" would obviously be impossible, given the nuance these terms have acquired in modern English. I am aware that "mentor" has a distinctly contemporary air about it in American English, and this is not, I confess, appropriate, but I have sought in vain for an alternative.

Chinese has for "honor," "honor and obey."

² In KP §1 the qualities which lead to the bodhisattva's loss of wisdom are listed. These include: *agauravau bhavati dharma ca dharmabhāṇake ca*, "he is without a respectful attitude toward the teaching and the preacher of the teaching."

³ **ayoniśomanasikāra*. See BHSD s.v. *yonisās* and *ayoniśās*.

⁴ KP §5 (and at *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 148.11-12): *āśrutānām anuddiṣṭānām ca sūtrāntānām pratikṣeṇa*: "Repudiating those sūtra discourses not studied [by oneself] and not explained [to oneself]." I should remark that I have usually translated √*śru* forms such as *śruta* with English verbal forms such as study, learn, etc., although literally the sense is of course "to hear." The aural sense of these terms is very important, but hearing implies so much more than merely having sounds hit one's ear drums that after considerable hesitation I decided against using "hear" in cases such as the present one. In a culture such as our own in which learning is primarily visual it is hard to convey the sense that is meant by such hearing. I only hope that my translations do not, as a result, give a wrong impression of the emphasis of the original.

⁵ See KP §125 *śūnyatādrṣṭyāpy anarthiko bhavati kaḥ punar vāda ātmasatvajīvapaṣapudgala-drṣṭyā*: "He is disinterested even in wrong speculations on emptiness, not to mention in wrong speculations on a self, living being, life-force, human or person." See also KP §52.

⁶ I originally gave this a distinctly Mahāyānist cast by translating as follows: "Not comprehending the teaching about the unconditioned [nature of all] things, but following after only conditioned [objects, rather than nirvāṇa]." I now think this is perhaps rather too much. It may be that one could indeed read the expression in this way, but it is probably better and more in keeping with the tone of the sūtra as a whole to give the more conservative rendering I have chosen. Chinese has: "hearing that all *saṃskāras* are originally unproduced he understands the conditioned things (*saṃskṛta*) but does not understand the unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*)."

unproduced.¹

- 8) The feeling that one is falling into a great abyss [which occurs] when one hears that all things are in their intrinsic nature unproduced.²

Kāśyapa, these eight obstruct the qualities [which define a true] śramaṇa. The renunciant must abandon them.

I.6

“Kāśyapa, I do not explain that a śramaṇa is a śramaṇa by virtue of his physical appearance and attributes,³ but I explain that the śramaṇa who practices virtuous qualities⁴ is a [true] śramaṇa.⁵ Kāśyapa, a śramaṇa must wear the pure monas-

¹ See KP §134: *sa ca ajāti sarvvadharmāṇām śrutvā utrasati samtrasari samtrāsam āpadyate*, “hearing that all things have no arisal he is frightened, scared and afflicted by fear.”

² *G-yang sa = prapāta*. KP §123 *śūnyatānupalambhās ca dharmeṣu śrutvā prapātasamjñā bhavati*. “And hearing that things are inconceivable because of emptiness he feels as if he has confronted an abyss.” Chinese has incorporated Tibetan item 7 into item 6, and has items 7 and 8 corresponding to Tibetan 8: “hearing the preaching of the sequential teaching he falls down into a great abyss. Hearing that all things are intrinsically unborn, without a nature, without ? (無出 = ?), he is mentally confused.”

³ Chinese: “shaven head and dharma-clothes.” See KP §122, in a discussion of those who are not true śramaṇas: *varṇarūpalingasamsthānaśramaṇa = kha dog dang rtags kyi dbyings kyi dge sbyong*, “one who is a śramaṇa by virtue of his figure, outward form, distinguishing marks and appearance.” Compare the Brahmanical *Nārada-parivṛāja Upaniṣad* (Schrader 1912: 180.9-10): *na daṇḍadhāreṇa na muṇḍena / na veṣeṇa na dambhācāreṇa muktiḥ //*, translated by Olivelle (1992: 203): “Not by carrying a staff, not by shaving the head, not by a special dress, and not by a hypocritical life does a man become free.” One might also bring to mind the common Buddhist critiques of the “true Brāhmaṇa,” not distinguished by his outer marks, birth or so on, but by his nature and spiritual accomplishments.

⁴ Here in the *Ratnarāśi* we have the Sanskrit available, and it is *guṇadharmā*. Compare the term *śramaṇaguṇasamanvāgata* used in the *Ugra*, quoted *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 198.4 (see Mochizuki 1988: 284-303; T. 310 [XI] 477c28 has 沙門功德). See also below I.8 for *śramaṇaguṇadharmā*. MW defines the term *guṇadharmā* as “the virtue or duty incident to the possession of certain qualities (as clemency is the virtue and duty of royalty).” The RGV (Johnston 1950: 77.1, Takasaki 1966: 303 note 71) has the term. It appears also in AKB 189.12 (ad III.100b), where however it contrasts with *dravyadharmā* of the Vaiśeṣikas, and is therefore not relevant to our case. In the RGV the term is rendered 功德法, in the AKB Xuanzang 德法, Paramārtha 求那法. In the *Ratnarāśi guṇadharmam pratipatyā* is rendered 有功德儀式具足者, “fully equipped with virtuous qualities and ascetic purification practices.” (儀式 usually is

tic robes on his body with a mind unstained by impurity.¹ Why? Kāśyapa, I prescribe² that the monastic robe is for one without impurities,³ but, Kāśyapa, I say that all of those who, characterized by impurity, wear the pure monastic robes on their bodies burn the monastic robes,⁴ except for those earnest in their intention.⁵ Why? Because this is the banner of the Nobles. These garments,

dhutaṅga or (*saṃ*)*ācāra* in the *Ratnarāṣi*; literally the Chinese means “ritual practices.” It must be admitted that its meaning is not yet totally clear. A hint, however, may be gained from KP §125, quoted in full in the Introduction, in which, after contrasting three types of false śramaṇas including “the one who is an ascetic by virtue of his figure, outward form, distinguishing marks and appearance,” the KP describes the ascetic engaged in real correct practice.

⁵ See the well-known verse: “Neither nakedness, nor tangled hair, nor mud, nor fasting, nor sleeping on the bare ground, nor covering oneself with a coat of dirt, nor religious exercise in a squatting posture can purify a mortal who has not overcome desire. But who even adorned should practice the teaching, restrained, tranquil, self-controlled, practicing celibacy, giving up violence toward all creatures, he is a [true] brahman, he is a [true] śramaṇa, he is a [true] monk.” Uv 33.1-2 = Dhṛp141-2 = Mv iii.412, 15-22 (2nd verse = GDhp 80 = PtDhp 196 = Divy 339.26-29 = CPS 17.16): *na nagnacaryā na jaṭā na paṅkā no 'nāśanam sthaṇḍilaśāyikā vā / na rajomalaṇi notkuṭukaprahāṇaṇi śodheta martyaṇi hy avitṛṇakāṅkṣam // alaṅkṛtaś cāpi careta dharmāṇi kṣānto dānto niyato brahmacārī / sarveṣu bhūteṣu nidhāya daṇḍaṇi sa brāhmaṇaḥ sa śramaṇaḥ sa bhikṣuḥ //*. MN i.281,31ff. (= *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 [I] 725c18-26c24) has an almost exact parallel: “I do not speak, monks, of the śramaṇa-hood of one who wears the outer monastic robes merely because of his wearing those outer monastic robes. I do not speak, monks, of the śramaṇa-hood of one who is a naked ascetic merely because of his nakedness. ... one who dwells in dust and mud ... the ritual bather ... one who dwells at the foot of trees ... one who dwells in the open air ... one who constantly stands upright ... one who eats only at intervals ... one who concentrates on mantras ... one who has tangled hair” The text, having listed these ascetic practices through which some seek perfection goes on to specify that it is the one who frees himself of negative mental qualities and eventually removes the *āsava*s who is, therefore (284.27-28), “a śramaṇa through the destruction of the *āsava*s.”

¹ Chinese has “a mind free of lust, hatred and delusion.” This totally misses the classical pun here on *kaśāya*, “impurity,” and *kāśāya*, “the ochre monastic robe.” The pun and its meaning are discussed in the Introduction.

² The term rendered here as “stipulate,” *anu*√*jñā*, is commonly translated “allow.” However, in many contexts in which the Buddha speaks he is not so much allowing or permitting as laying down rules. This is commonly the case in the Vinaya literature, and in this context the CPD (s.v. *anu-jānāti*) explicitly recognizes that “(in *Vinaya*) when the *Buddha* speaks, nearly = to ordain or prescribe.”

³ Chinese has here, and for the next “impurities,” “whose mind is without lust, hatred and delusion.”

⁴ The extant Sanskrit for this expression, *kāśāyadagdhā*, is odd if it is meant to mean “burn the robes,” and would more naturally be understood as “are burned by the robes,” as Hoernle (1916) in fact translates in *Manuscript Remains*. But both Tibetan and Chinese are rather clear on the meaning: *de dag thams cad ni ngur smrig thig pa*, 爲燒滅袈裟. See the Introduction for a detailed discussion.

⁵ Chinese: “except for those who are single-minded in upholding the precepts but still cannot uphold them.”

which belong to those who are repentant¹ and practice free from passion, conform to their tranquility and are attendant upon their friendliness. In this regard, Kāśyapa, what is the banner of the Nobles?² Kāśyapa, these twelve are the banner of the Nobles. Which twelve? Kāśyapa,

- 1) Monastic discipline is the banner of the Nobles.³
- 2) Mental trance is the banner of the Nobles.
- 3) Wisdom is the banner of the Nobles.
- 4) Liberation is the banner of the Nobles.
- 5) Knowledge and vision of liberation is the banner of the Nobles.⁴
- 6) Entrance into the Truths is the banner of the Nobles.⁵
- 7) Entrance into dependent co-origination is the banner of the Nobles.⁶
- 8) The four concentrations are the banner of the Nobles.

¹ Sanskrit and Chinese omit “repentant.”

² Sanskrit: “In that regard, Kāśyapa, listen to what are the banners of the nobles.”

³ If the reconstructed letter suggested by Thomas and printed by him in brackets is correct, [ta]pa, then the Sanskrit reads: “asceticism.” But, given the fact that this is a stock phrase (see the next note), and that the Tibetan and Chinese agree on having *śīla*, this is rather unlikely. The MS is, however, perfectly clear and there can be no doubt about *pa*. Thomas 118 (7) suggested that the neuter *dhvajam* agrees with *tapas*, but while it is true that *dhvaja* looks to be a neuter, this does not prove we must reconstruct **tapa*. I have no suggestion about how to understand the -*pa* of the manuscript.

⁴ These first five items constitute a group, variously named: *śīla*, *saṃādhi*, *prajñā vimukti*, and *vimuktijñānadarśana*. This set is classified as a set of *skandhas* (Pāli *khandha*, e.g. at SN i.99,30-100,4; DN iii.279,14-17), also termed *sampadā*. See also Mhy. 104-108.

⁵ Chinese specifies “the four noble truths.”

⁶ Sanskrit rather “awareness of dependent ...” See CPD s.v. *anubujjhana*, “awakening, enlightenment, understanding,” quoting *Paṭisambhidāmagga*. BHSD s.v. *anubudhyana* quotes only the present passage [Edgerton passively hyper-corrects -*buddhya*-]. Not in Waldschmidt et al. 1973-. The translation note (by Thomas or Hoernle, page 120, note 15) suggests however a possible misreading, the correct reading being **avatāra*. While this would agree with Tibetan, it is hard to see how such a confusion could be explained either graphically or phonetically. On the other hand, Chinese 能解十二因緣, “being able to comprehend the twelve-fold causality (= *pratītyasamutpāda*),” could agree with *anubudhyana*. Ultimately either reading gives more or less the same sense, since “enter into” here obviously means “comprehend, understand.”

- 9) The four immeasurables are the banner of the Nobles.¹
- 10) The four formless attainments are the banner of the Nobles.
- 11) The entry into the certainty [to attain nirvāṇa] is the banner of the Nobles.²
- 12) The destruction of the depravities is the banner of the Nobles.³

Kāśyapa, these twelve are the banner of the Nobles.

L.7

“Kāśyapa, I say that whoever,⁴ without possessing these banners, wears the pure⁵ monastic robes, the garments of the saintly attitudes,⁶ practices an erroneous Teaching.⁷ I say that he dwells in contradiction to the teaching.⁸ I

¹ The order of items 8 and 9 is reversed in the Sanskrit and the Chinese.

² Sanskrit reads *niyāmāvakkrānti*, which is, or is part of, a set phrase, on which see the detailed note in Lamotte 1962: 115-16 (65). Lamotte explains: “*Niyāma* (variants *niyama*, *nyāma*) or, more completely, *samyaktvaniyāmāvakkrānti* is the entry into the absolute determination to acquire the supreme good. It is concerned with a *kṣānti* by which one enters into possession of a state of predestination relative to the future acquisition of *samyaktva*, that is, Nirvāṇa.” See also Wogihara 1930-36: 28-31, Mochizuki 1932-36: 2664a-2665a, and BHSD s.v. *niyāma*. The form is quoted for Pāli CPD s.v. *avakkanti*. Tibetan *skyon med par zhugs pa* = *nyāmāvakkrāntaḥ* at Mhy. 6503. Chinese here in the *Ratnarāśi* has “entry into the four-fold certainty is the banner” I cannot locate any such category in the sources available to me, including the *Sanzang Fashu* 三藏法數.

³ **āsravaḥṣaya*. This item is omitted in the Sanskrit MS, evidently by accident. The numbering in the MS itself, however, would lead one to believe that it is item 11 rather than item 12 which is missing, since the numbering skips from 10 to 12 omitting number 11. But in fact it is item 11 which is listed under number 12, and the real final term is missing.

⁴ Sanskrit and Chinese here specify “monk.”

⁵ Sanskrit and Chinese omit “pure.”

⁶ The Tibetan and the Sanskrit represent slightly different readings; Tibetan *’phags pa’i rigs gos* seems to equal something like **āryagotra*- or **āryavaṃsa-vastra*, while Sanskrit has *āryānām dhvajam*, the banner of the nobles.

⁷ Sanskrit has *vitathadharmapratipanna*, and Tibetan *nor pa’i chos la zhugs pa*, understanding **vitatha-dharmaṃ pratiṇpad*. It is perhaps preferable to understand as, “he practices the teaching in an incorrect way,” that is, with *vitathadharmā* as an instrumental *tatpuruṣa*, rather than as an adjectival *karmadhāraya*. The Tibetan translator’s practice of following the word order of the Sanskrit compound makes it difficult to understand his rendering correctly without reference to the original. The Chinese has

say that he dwells far from the teachings of the Tathāgata.¹ I say that he dwells in opposition to the side of nirvāṇa. I say he is partial to the side of saṃsāra.² I say he is caught by the hook of Māra.³ I say he has not taken possession of the essence [of the teachings].⁴ I say he has fallen from the teaching. I say he

我說此比丘是邪法行。"I say that this monk is [one who has an] incorrect dharma practice," again very literally with *vitathadharmapratipanna* translated word for word into 邪法行。

⁸ On the form *uḍḍara*-, Edgerton BHSD s.v. refers only to the present passage and says "conjecturally rendered (practicing) heretical (principles)." Perhaps he based himself upon the note of Thomas (121, note 22) in which he says: "The context requires a word with a bad sense, such as 'heretical.' Perhaps derived from *uddara* or *avadara* from *√uddr* or *avadr*, 'split.'" Tibetan has *chos dang 'gal bar gnas pa*, which regularly stands for *viruddha*. The phonological resemblance between the two forms, *uḍḍara* and *viruddha*, is enough to make me think there may be some connection. Chinese has yet another understanding (apparently), reading 非寂滅行。I cannot immediately see what hint this might provide to solving the problem.

¹ As Thomas points out (121, note 23), Sanskrit *dūṣṭhitam* may be correct, but is perhaps better understood with Tibetan as *dū[ra]sthitam*.

² Sanskrit mistakenly *saṃskāra* for *saṃsāra*! As has been pointed out many times, the Chinese translator Lokakṣema for example regularly renders both *saṃsāra* and *saṃskāra* by 生死, birth and death, usually standard for *saṃsāra*. See Harrison 1990: 153, note 5, and Lancaster 1968: 390. It is worthwhile pointing out that the often appealed to Gāndhārī is obviously not applicable here. In Gāndhārī: *saṃskāra* = *saghara* and *saṃsāra* = *satsara* (Brough 1962: 310. The latter transcription with *-tsa-* is somewhat problematic; see Brough's §17). How Lokakṣema could have justified such a translation remains to be explained, but might not passages such as the present one in Sanskrit contribute to such an explanation?

³ Tibetan has rendered "hook of selfishness or pride," but both Sanskrit and Chinese have "caught by the hook of Māra." Evidently the Tibetan translators read instead of (our Sanskrit text's) *māra* *baḍiṣa-grastam* rather than **mānabaḍiṣa*. SN ii.226, 17-18 (XVII.2 [2] 4) has: *bāḷisiko ti kho bhikkhave mārassetam pāpimato adhvivacanaṃ*, "hook [or bard], monks, is a designation of Māra, the evil one." See also SN iv.159,9-10 (XXXV.189 [3] 6).

There is, however, a passage in the Chinese *Samyuktāgama* 雜阿含經 T. 99 (966) (II) 248b4-9 in which being caught up by *māna* 慢 is perhaps being compared to being caught by a fish hook 鐵鉤鎖。But the interpretation of the passage, and of the subject of the verbs, is not totally clear. The passage reads:

Those Sentient beings, [the non-Buddhists who you met] previously, have a prideful belief in a self, a deluded pride, and they are tormented by that deluded pride, for deluded pride accumulates more deluded pride. They do not have full understanding [of pride: **mānābhisamaya*]. They are entangled [by pride?] like a dog's intestines, like they are caught on a fish hook. And like disturbed grass [which wafts back and forth in the wind] they gallop back and forth from this world to the other, from the other world to this they gallop back and forth, but they cannot escape [*saṃsāra*]. Pūrṇa. All sentient beings who have destroyed deluded pride without remainder will in the long night [of *saṃsāra*] attain liberation (*kṣema*) and happiness.

先諸衆生。我慢邪慢。邪慢所迫。邪慢集邪慢。不無間等。亂如狗腸。如鐵鉤鎖。亦如亂草。往反驅馳。此世他世。他世此世。驅馳往反。不能遠離。富隣尼。一切衆生於諸邪慢無餘永滅者。彼一切衆生長夜安隱快樂。 Note that the parallel in T. 100 (200) (II) 448a11-16 does not have the same terms.

⁴ The addition within brackets is conjectural, but I do not see what else could be intended here. (I understand that the essence of the teachings would be fundamentally equivalent to the essence of awaken-

dwells in an incorrect path. Therefore, Kāśyapa, if a śramaṇa wears the pure monastic robes on his body he must do so with a mind unstained by impurities.

I.8

If he has not yet obtained the fruit,¹ he should wear the robe on his body with eight [types of] respect. Which eight? [He should wear the robe with]

- 1) The idea that it is a shrine,² and
- 2) The idea that it is the teacher, and
- 3) The idea that it is pacified,³ and
- 4) The idea of friendliness,⁴ and
- 5) The idea of respect [toward the robe as] toward the Buddha, and⁵
- 6) The idea of shame, and
- 7) The idea of modesty, and
- 8) The thought that “I must become free of impurity.”⁶

ing, perhaps the only other real possibility.) Chinese has rendered: “has not passed beyond saṃsāra.” I am far from certain, but it is possible that here the Chinese translation has confused *sāra* and *saṃsāra*. But I do not know what Sanskrit term could lie behind 度, “pass over,” here. At KP §120, one of two causes of the renunciant’s pain is *anāhattasārasya kālakriyā* (rendered in Tibetan *snying po ma blangs par ‘chi ba’i dus byed pa*), “dying without having undertaken the essence [of the teaching].”

¹ Chinese actually includes the last clause of I.7 with this portion. Chinese consequently has: “Kāśyapa. Therefore, when the renunciant monk wears the monastic robes upon his body, if he has not yet attained the fruit of the śramaṇa,”

² Or, with Chinese, “stūpa.” Tibetan regularly *mchod rten* for both *caitya* and *stūpa*, but Chinese 塔 regularly renders *stūpa*. I have nevertheless understood the Tibetan following the close parallel in the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*, quoted in the notes below. There we have the Sanskrit text from the *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, and the reading is *caitya*.

³ **upaśānta*.

⁴ **maitrī*.

⁵ The word “as” is made explicit in Chinese.

⁶ Chinese, as usual, has “lust, hatred and delusion” for “impurity.”

Because the pure monastic robes conform to the conduct proper to a śramaṇa,¹ he should wear them on his body with those eight [types of] respect. Kāśyapa, those who, being careless,² are not given to self-restraint and, having failed to uphold these virtuous qualities of a śramaṇa³ still wear the pure monastic robes on their bodies, do not produce these [types of] respect [toward those robes].⁴

I.9

Kāśyapa, there is an individual hell⁵ named ‘Torture’ of one who imitates the

¹ *dge sbyong gi tshul dang 'thun pa* probably reflects *śramaṇasya sārūpya. For the latter expression in a slightly different application, see *Lalitavistara* 383.3-4: *na śramaṇasya sārūpyāni iti kṛtvā tathāgato na pratigrhṇite sma*, “The Tathāgata did not take [some bowls made of precious substances], thinking that they were not suitable for a śramaṇa.” Just before that (382.22), however, the same idea is expressed with: *tāni na śramaṇapratirūpāni iti kṛtvā*. See also BHSD s.v. sārūpya.

² The term *vaidaryā* (or *vaidarpya*?) is not at all clear. Both the *Ratnarāśi* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* render it with Tibetan *lhod*, which as Edgerton BHSD s.v. *vaidaryā* points out, means loose, slack, careless. Should we look etymologically to some derivative of *vīḍṛ*, perhaps in the causative meaning of “to scatter”?

³ So I understand the Tibetan *dge sbyong gi yon tan gyi chos 'di dag las nyams par*, but its correspondence with the extant Sanskrit version's *itah śramaṇaguṇadharmād uddhurāḥ* is not quite clear to me. In Sanskrit *uddhura* means “freed from a burden, unrestrained,” or more literally “one who has unyoked himself.” Perhaps we should look etymologically to *udḥṛ* (a doublet with *udḥṛ*) in the sense of removal, separation. Bendall and Rouse render the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* passage (134) “free from the rule of the ascetic's virtue.” Chinese has “free from the rules (法) of the śramaṇa.” See the notes to I.6 above.

⁴ From “Kāśyapa, those who ...,” the Chinese text has attached the sentence to the following section, I.9: “Kāśyapa. If they are dissatisfied with their practice of the four saintly attitudes, do not follow the practices of a śramaṇa, and do not respect the monastic robes in these eight ways, then they are counted apart, among the imitation śramaṇas, and fall into minor hells.” See the Introduction for some interesting parallels.

⁵ On the *pratyekanaraka*, see BHSD s.v. *pratyeka*. Edgerton interpreted it as a hell of less severe punishment than that in a regular or great hell, but this is probably not correct. We have a considerable number of references to such hells in Buddhist literature, and the term has been discussed in Mochizuki 1932-36: 1248bc and La Vallée Poussin 1923-31: iii.155, note 1. Both Nakamura 1981: 347c and Oda 1917: 468a follow the AKB (Pradhan 1975: 165.5-7) and understand the term to refer to an individual hell in which one experiences by him or her self the maturation of his or her own karma: “Individual hells are produced by separate individual acts of a large number of people, or of two or of one. Their variety is multifarious, their location unfixed. They are in river, mountain, or desert regions, or in other [locations], and because they are located below.” *pratyekaṃ narakāś tu svaiḥ svaiḥ karmabhir abhinirvṛttāḥ / bahūnāṃ sattvānāṃ dvayor ekasya vā / teṣāṃ anekaprakalpo bhedaḥ sthānāṃ cāniyataṃ nadīparvata-marupradeśeṣy anyeṣu vā 'dhaś ca bhāvāt*. As La Vallée Poussin (op cit.) pointed out, the hells

appearance of a śramaṇa.’ Kāśyapa, in that individual hell, in accord with their imitation of the śramaṇa they are tortured¹ with their garments ablaze, their heads ablaze, their begging bowls ablaze, their sitting mats ablaze, their couches ablaze. Whatever possessions and goods they have are all burned up, set blazing, set afire² and they experience those tortures in accord with their imitations of the appearance of a śramaṇa.³ Why? Because they are thus characterized by impure actions of body, speech and mind, and the future realms of rebirth⁴ of those who are characterized by impure actions of body, speech and mind also become impure.⁵

enumerated at SN ii.254ff. are “individuated,” in the sense that the sufferings of the damned correspond exactly to the sins they committed. This is in fact not an unusual pattern, although the term *pratyekanaraka* is not necessarily used to designate such a situation. The term *pratyekanaraka* is discussed, in addition to the sources given in BHSD, in T. 1506 (XXV) 28a17-19, (translated by Beal 1871: 65), in which the description of “frontier hells” 邊地獄 corresponds with the AKB’s description of the *pratyekanaraka*; see also *Nyāyānusāra* T. 1562 (XXIX) 517a26ff.; and *Yogācārabhūmi* T. 1579 (XXX) 297a26-29; the latter refers for details to the 吉祥問採錄豆子經. So far I have not identified this text. In Pāli the term *paccekaniraya* appears in the commentary to *Suttanipāta Mahāvagga* 10 (*Kokālikasutta*; Smith 1917: 476,27-28) in the following: *abbudo nirayo ti abbudo nāma koci paccekanirayo n’atthi, avīcimhi yeva abbudagaṇanāya paccanokāso pana abbudo nirayo ti vutto, esa nayo nirabbudādisu*. In a verse in the canonical *Jātaka* v.266, 15-16 (XIX *Saṭṭhinipāta*, 2 *Samkiccapātaka* 530, verse 84), we find what might be associated with this term, if we understand the compound to have been broken for metrical reasons: *icc’ete aṭṭha nirayā akkhātā duratikkamā / ākiṇṇā luddakammehi paccekā soḷas’ussadā //*. Note that while the Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāsi* has 小地獄, the quotation in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has just 地獄. Generally speaking the term is rendered in Tibetan as *nyi tshe ba’i sems can dmyal ba*, with the variant *nyi tshe’i sems can dmyal ba*; the latter form is that given in Mhy. 4944.

⁶ Both Sanskrit and Chinese agree in omitting “torture.” Sanskrit has only *śramaṇavarṇaprati-rūpaka*.

¹ See BHSD s.v. *kāraṇā*.

² See *Ratnarāsi* III.14, and compare Mhy. 226: ...*ādīptaḥ pradīptaḥ samprajvalito* ‘gninā ekajvalibhūto nirvāpyate = (b)sreg(s) shing / cing tshig ste mes rab tu ‘bar zhing ‘bar ba gcig tu gyur pa zhi bar byed do. Mhy. 5249: *ādīptaḥ* = ‘bar, 5242 *pradīptaḥ* = rab tu ‘bar, 5243 *sampradīptaḥ* = kun tu / du rab tu ‘bar, 5244 *samprajvalito* = kun tu / du rab tu mched / ‘ched cing ‘bar, 5245 *ekajvalibhūto dhyāyati* = me lce gcig tu gyur cing (b)sreg go. See the expressions in the Dbh (Rahder 1926: 33.17-18), and Vinaya iii.107,23-26.

³ There is a very interesting parallel in the *Maitreyamahāsimhanādasūtra*, for which see the Introduction.

⁴ I have given a slightly round-about rendering of **gati*, perhaps more usually rendered “destiny.”

⁵ For the whole paragraph see KP §122, quoted in full in the Introduction.

I.10

Kāśyapa, if one who is not śramaṇa but falsely claims to be a śramaṇa and who is not a follower of the practice of purity but falsely claims to be a follower of the practice of purity¹ accepts the praise offered by those who uphold the precepts and those who are endowed with virtuous good qualities,² he³ suffers eight [types of] contempt through that bad action.⁴ Which eight?

- 1) He becomes like a stupid [insensible object],⁵ and
- 2) His position becomes difficult and he becomes slothful, and
- 3) He becomes a woman laughed at by many people, and
- 4) He becomes unfree,⁶ and a slave, and
- 5) He becomes of low caste, and ugly, and

¹ Mhy 9143-44: *āśramaṇaḥ śramaṇapratijñāḥ, abrahmacārī brahmacārīpratijñāḥ = dge sbyong ma yin par dge sbyong du khas 'che/mche ba, tshangs par spyod pa ma yin par tshangs par spyod par khas 'che ba*. The expression is of course also a well-known stock phrase in Pāli: AN i.108,21-22, ii.239,30-31, SN iv.180,31-181,1, Vin ii.236,25 [etc.] = *assamaṇaṃ samaṇapatiññaṃ, abrahmacāriṃ brahmacārīpatiññaṃ*.

² Chinese treats these two qualifications as one: “those who uphold the precepts, endowed with virtuous good qualities.”

³ Chinese adds here: “that precept breaking monk accepting that respect and worship even though he knows himself to be evil, that evil monk through these roots of demerit will suffer”

⁴ Cf. KP §117: *dvāv imau kāśyapa pravrajitasya paridāgho katamo dvau / yad uta ... śīlavantā guṇavantā cāntikād upasthānaparicaryāsvikarāṇaṃ*. “These two, Kāśyapa, are burning torments for a renunciant. Which two? Namely, ... accepting worship and devotion from those who uphold the precepts and those who uphold the virtues.”

⁵ Both Zhang et al. 1985 s.v. *bem po*, and Das 1902 s.v. *bem* quote the expression *bem po ltar lkug*, “stupid, senseless like a log of wood or physical matter.” It is possible that the term stands for **jāda* (Wayman 1959: 53 gives the equivalence *bem po = jāda* [sic!], but without any reference). Chinese has rendered the eight items of the list as follows: “1) he is stupid; 2) he is dumb (i.e., he cannot speak; **mūka*); 3) he receives a short and ugly body; 4) his face will be ugly, and those who see him face on or askance will laugh in scorn; 5) obtaining a female body, he will become a poor slave or servant; 6) his form will be weak and exhausted, and he will be injured and die young; 7) he will not be respected by others and will always have a bad reputation; 8) he will not be able to encounter a buddha.”

⁶ Probably *rang dbang med* = **asvatantra*.

- 6) He becomes of low caste, of lowly origin,¹ and
- 7) No one will come to meet him, and
- 8) He does not gladden those worthy of respect.

He suffers these eight [types of] contempt. Therefore, Kāśyapa, hearing about such negative things as these, evil monks should not accept the praise offered by others.

I.11

If that one who while not a śramaṇa, Kāśyapa, falsely claims to be śramaṇa, while not a follower of the practice of purity falsely claims to be a follower of the practice of purity, should not obtain on this wide earth so much as that [space] to eject a glob of spit,² how much less [should he expect] a place to lift up and set down his foot.³ Why? Because this wide earth, Kāśyapa, was given by kings of old to those who uphold the precepts, those who are virtuous and those worthy of veneration, in order for them to carry out their practice.⁴

I.12

In that regard, Kāśyapa, that fool is unworthy of any gift of faith at all, even a

¹ Mhy. 6412 *alpeśākhyah* = *dbang chung bar grags pa*. MW s.v. defines this as “named after an insignificant chief or master, of low origin,” citing it as Buddhist, but without source. For Buddhist materials, see BHSD s.v., Mv i.28,7, and Senart’s note i.392.

² For *khetapiṇḍa*, see *Ratnarāṣi* §VI.9, quoted *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 130.18.

³ See the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 267.15 (quoting *Ratnamegha*) for the terms *kramān utkṣipati ... nikṣipati*.

⁴ I suspect that there are in Indian lore references to Kings giving the earth to ascetics, but I have yet to track down such a reference.

place to set down and lift up his foot; and if this applies to a place to set down and lift up his foot, how much more unworthy is he to enjoy all gifts of faith, that is, the couches or the stools, or the promenade walks, or the sitting mats, or the caves, or the monasteries, or the pleasure groves, or the park sites, or the properties, or the bowls, or the monastic robes, or the alms, or the bedding, or the medicaments, or any equipment at all which belongs to the local community or belongs to the universal community. You should have faith in this, Kāśyapa. You should understand it.

I.13

One who while not a śramaṇa, Kāśyapa, falsely claims to be a śramaṇa, while not a follower of the practice of purity falsely claims to be a follower of the practice of purity, cannot purify¹ a gift of faith even as small as the point of the tip of a hair.² Why? Because, Kāśyapa, I teach that the community of the saints³ is like the great ocean,⁴ it is a field of merit and the best of those worthy of rever-

¹ Chinese: “requite.”

² The expression is a stock one: Mhy. 6489 *skra'i rtse mo'i mtha'am cha shas* = *vālāgrakoṭiḥ*. Compare Pāli AN iii.403,14-15: *Yāvakīvañ cāhaṃ Ānanda Devadattassa vālaggaṇoṭṭittuddanamattam pi sukkaṃ dhammaṃ addasaṃ*

The *Maitreyamahāsīmhanādasūtra* T. 310 (23) (XI) 502c22 has one of 4 微細煩惱 = *rab tu byung ba'i nyon mongs pa cha phra ba*, minor defilements of a renunciant, as accepting the gift of faith from another while knowing oneself that one is a violator of the precepts 自知犯受他信施 = (P 65a7-8, M 130a6, S 158a2): *shes shing rtogs bzhin du* [P /] *dad pas byin pa yongs su longs spyod par byed pa ste*. See La Vallée Poussin's note in AKB v.78 on *anuśaya*.

³ *'phags pa'i dge 'dun* = **ārya-saṃgha*. CPD s.v. *ariya-saṃgha* renders “the noble fraternity,” and of course this is possible. But it is necessary to note that the term could as easily mean “community of the Āryas, that is the noble ones,” and I have followed this. The term seems to be rare in canonical Pāli. For a related discussion, see Norman 1990.

⁴ Compare the following passages: *Da Zhidu lun* 大智度論 T. 1509 (XXV) 225a8-10 (= Lamotte 1944-80: 1399): “The monastic community is like the waters of the great ocean / Bounded by the shores of the precepts. / A precept-breaking monk / At the end of his life will not be counted among the monks / As the waters of the great ocean / Do not give lodging to a corpse.” (The last image is proverbial in Pāli

ence. Faithful brahmans or householders, Kāśyapa, may make offerings to that [false śramaṇa] with the idea that those offerings are infinite. But, Kāśyapa, if a precept-breaking fool were to enjoy a gift of faith even as small as the tip of a hair cleaved in a hundredth portion,¹ because of the purification of the donor and the benefactor, as small as is his enjoyment of a gift of faith as tiny as the mere tip of a hair, so great an ocean of [evil] karma would he amass.² Therefore, Kāśyapa, you must learn that the gift of faith is to be enjoyed by those who are pure in [their practice of] the precepts.”

I.14

When that teaching was preached,³ two hundred yogācāra⁴ monks hearing this teaching wept, and the tears flowing they said: “Even though we may die,⁵ as

and other Buddhist literatures.) At *Ekottarāgama* 增壹阿含經 T. 125 (II) 792a19 the monastic community is compared to the sea. The same text T. 125 (II) 575a22-23 compares the community of saints to the ocean, since both produce rare jewels. (The last passage corresponds more or less to SN i.233,18 [XI.2.6], but without the image of the ocean.) See also the *Sūryagarbhavaipulyasūtra* T. 397 (13) (XIII) 215b24-25, which has the community of monks as a great ocean of merit: 衆僧大功德海.

¹ Compare *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Dutt 1934: 27.9-10 = *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Ghōṣa 1902-13: 81.16: *śatadhā bhinnayā vālāgrakoṭyā* ...

² The syntax of this passage (in Tibetan as well as in English!) is rather difficult, and I am not certain that I have understood it correctly. I am especially unsure of the meaning of the expression “because of the purification of the donor and benefactor.” It may be that it should be attached to what follows: the gift of faith given by a donor and benefactor for their own purification — if the precept-breaker consumes even a small portion of that he will reap correspondingly great negative results. The Chinese reads as follows: “If there is a precept-breaking monk, just as one splits a single hair into a hundred bits, if that evil monk were to accept a gift of faith of even the amount of one hair, as small as the hair’s portion which he accepts he subsequently destroys a correspondingly great ocean’s amount of the donor’s meritorious fruit, and he cannot completely repay him. Kāśyapa, therefore [a monk] should purify his mind to accept gifts of faith. Kāśyapa, you should imitate this [behavior].”

³ In the *Suvarṇa(pra)bhāṣottama* in Tibetan (Noble 1944: 174.15): *bstan pa 'di bshad pa na = asmin nirdeśe nirdeśyamāne*, but our Sanskrit text has rather *atha tasyām eva pariṣadi*, “in that very assembly.”

⁴ For the term “Yogācāra monk,” see the discussion in the Introduction.

⁵ I thank David Jackson for his suggestion on this rendering of *bdag cag ni gum yang rung*. The Sanskrit is perhaps a little different, being *kālaṃ vayan ... kariṣyāmo na punar ...*, “we shall die, but still

long as we have not obtained the fruit [of the śramaṇa state]¹ we should not enjoy even one rice-ball given by the faithful.” The Blessed One said: “Worthy men,² good! Good! You in this fashion, modest, full of regret,³ fearful of censure in the other world⁴ beautify this preaching.⁵

I.15

I permit⁶ the gift of faith, Kāśyapa, to two śramaṇas. Which two? The one who is intent and the one who is liberated.⁷ And to two others: the one who sees impermanence with respect to all conditioned things, and the one who attains the

....” The Chinese also clearly indicates the future. I wonder whether this means or implies that the monks are willing to starve to death. As monks the only food they might obtain is that offered by donors, so declining such food would doom them to death by starvation, unless they were to renounce the monkhood, as they in fact do in III.19.

¹ After Chinese, and so when the same appears below.

² Tibetan *skyes bu dam pa* is generally (e.g. Mhy. 7358) equivalent to *satpuruṣa*, but here the extant Sanskrit reads *kulaputra*. The Chinese translations of the *Ratnarāṣi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* also have 善男子 = *kulaputra*. BHSD s.v. *satpuruṣa* is wrong to state that the category refers exclusively to laymen. As far as I can tell, however, almost no attention has been paid to this category by modern scholars, but see La Vallée Poussin 1923-26: vi.218 (AKB ad VI.40). It must remain questionable, however, how far such a scholastic conception of the *satpuruṣa* as that of the AKB may be applied to the sūtras. At least in Chinese there seems to be considerable overlap with terms sometimes equivalent to *mahāsattva*. See Hōbōgirin s.v. Daiji (by the sorely missed Anna Seidel).

³ The two terms *lajjā* and *kauṛṭya* are associated at Bbh 250.20-21.

⁴ The meaning, of course, is after death, in the next life or in between lives. For the whole expression, see the discussion in the Introduction.

⁵ Chinese: “you are the ornament (literally, necklace or neck ornament) of this present age.” I am not clear how 現世 could correspond to *idaṃ pravacanam*; is it “present dispensation” understood as “this age” (ignoring context)?

⁶ We have here, again, the term *anurjñā*, rendered above by “prescribe.” The sense here is surely that these two types of monk are permitted to accept a gift of faith, and no other type of monk is so qualified. In that sense, here too the Buddha is setting down a prescription.

⁷ There is a kind of word play I have not been able to capture in English, between the literal opposites *yuktasya* and *muktasya*, “yoked” and “freed.” The Chinese translators likewise could not express it. Exactly the same expression is found in the *Buddhapitakaduḥśīlanigrahī* (Peking #886: *mdo, tshu* 23b4). The entire passage from that text is quoted *in extenso* in the Introduction.

mind of liberation and friendliness.¹ Monks, in that regard that intent monk, yogācārin,² who practices what I have taught, having enjoyed the robes, begging bowl, sleeping mat, medicaments and equipments³ [obtained] from donors and benefactors, who sees the faults of saṃsāra,⁴ sees the impermanence in all conditioned things, understands that all conditioned things are suffering, zealously applies himself to the [fact that] all dharmas lack a self, and comprehends that nirvāṇa is calm,⁵ even though he enjoys mouthfuls of [food] as great as Mount Sumeru [given as a] gift of faith, still the offerings made to him become completely and totally pure. When [that monk] enjoys a gift of faith from donors and benefactors, the maturation of merit from that [gift] for those donors and benefactors has great power, and the benefit [to them] is great.⁶ Why? Because, monks, the attainment of a friendly attitude is the best of the material objects related to

¹ Sanskrit and Chinese omit: “And two others: the one who sees impermanence with respect to all conditioned things and the one who attains the mind of liberation and friendliness.”

² Chinese has “liberated monk,” omitting “yogācārin.”

³ The list of course is standard, *cīvara-piṇḍapāta-śayanāsana-glāna-pratyabhaisajya-pariṣkāra*. See BHSD s.v. *pariṣkāra*.

⁴ Chinese has “practices good dharmas and strictly upholds the precepts as I have taught” for “who practices what I have taught, having enjoyed the robes, begging bowl, sleeping mat, medicaments and equipments [obtained] from donors, sees the faults of saṃsāra.” Sanskrit has “practices my teachings.”

⁵ For this standard list, the “seals of the teaching, *dharmamudrā*,” see Lamotte 1970: 1368ff, with of course copious references. See also VKN III.25 (Lamotte 1962: 165, n. 51), and references in his index to *dharmodāna*. In the MRK see *Tathāgataguhyasūtra* T. 312 (XI) 741.b.10-16, *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* T. 316 (XI) 794.c.21-795.a.6.

The list here adds to each item a term signifying the monk’s understanding of the “seal.” The last term in Tibetan is “comprehends,” *rtogs pa*, whereas Sanskrit has “is one who longs for,” *abhikāṅkṣi*.

⁶ As La Vallée Poussin long ago pointed out (1923-31: iv.21, note 1), a sūtra passage is quoted in the AKB with which the present passage should be compared: “A strong monk, upholder of the precepts, possessed of good qualities, consuming alms [from a donor] and bodily realizing and attaining the immeasurable concentrations of mind and dwelling [therein], should for that reason expect for that donor and benefactor immeasurable, overflowing merit, overflowing goodness, a shower of happiness and joy.” The AKB (Pradhan 1975: 197.26-198.1 = Shastri 585.10-586.1) reads: *yasyograbhikṣuḥ śīlavān kalyāṇa-dharmā piṇḍakaṃ paribhujyāpramāṇaṃ cetaḥsamādhim kāyena sāṅgātṛvopasaṃpadya viharaty apramāṇas tannidāna[m] dāyakasya dānapater puṇyābhiṣyandaḥ kuṣalābhiṣyandaḥ sukhāśvādadhāraḥ pratikāṅkṣitavya iti*. I do not know if this passage has so far been identified.

See also BHSD s.v. *maharddhika*, *mahādyutika* and *anuśaṃsa*.

meritorious action.¹

I.16

Monks, if a monk who having enjoyed the robes, begging bowl, couch and equipments² of a donor and benefactor were to attain the immeasurable mind of liberation, you should know the maturation [of merit] of that donor and benefactor would also be immeasurable.³ Even, Kāśyapa, if possibly the oceans which are in three thousand times many thousands of world systems were to be exhausted, still there will be no exhaustion of all the natural results of that merit.⁴ Whoever, Kāśyapa, having enjoyed the gift of faith from a donor and benefactor should cause [the donor] disaster due to his failure to uphold the precepts, that deluded man must see how much damage he causes later.⁵ Therefore, Kāśyapa, śramaṇas with pure intention⁶ must abandon such qualities as the impurity of the śramaṇa, the sin of the śramaṇa, the dishonesty of the śramaṇa, the deceit of the śramaṇa, the guile of the śramaṇa, and the deception of the śramaṇa.

¹ See Mhy. 1703, *aupadhikaṃ puṇyakriyāvastu*. List of seven *aupadhika puṇyakriyāvastu*, for which see Lamotte 1949: 670 note 2, summary of AKVy 353-54 (see La Vallée Poussin 1923-26: iv.15, and notes). Chinese has the sentence as: "Because he always produces merit. There are three types of merit: 1) always donating food. 2) monasteries. 3) practicing friendliness. Among these three merits, friendliness is the best." This three-fold listing does not agree with that given in BHSD s.v. *puṇyakriyāvastu* and Nakamura 1981: 486d-487a.

² Sanskrit omits "couch and equipments."

³ Virtually the same expression in AN ii.54,23-25: *yassa bhikkhave bhikkhu cīvaram paribhūñja-māno appamāṇam cetosamādhim upasampajja viharati appamāṇo tassa puññābhisandho* See BHSD s.v. *cetosamādhi*.

⁴ For *nisyanda* (*rygu mthun pa*) as "natural result," see BHSD s.v.

⁵ The meaning of *phyir zhugs pa* is not completely clear to me.

⁶ Compare KP §30, 47, 33, where we find either *āsayaśuddha* or *śuddhāśaya*.

I.17

Kāśyapa, the title 'śramaṇa' is not something which issues from the eye, nor does it issue from the ear, nor from the nose, nor from the tongue, nor from the body, nor from the mind either; therefore one says 'śramaṇa.' [A śramaṇa] possesses cognition of the six sense spheres and the six superknowledges and the six mindfulnesses, dwells respecting the honorable ones, and dwells in the six dharmas gone beyond,¹ therefore people one says 'śramaṇa.'

The Chapter on the Śramaṇa, the First.

¹ Mhy 5104 (S. 5107) *pha rol tu 'gro ba = pārāyaṇam.*

The English Translation: Chapter Two

<The Monk>

II.1

People, Kāśyapa, use the word “monk.” Because one has overcome the defilements,¹ people call him a “monk.” Because: one has overcome the conception of self, one has overcome the conception of living being, the conception of life-essence, the conception of individuality, the conception of person, the conception of male, the conception of female, the conception of man, the conception of woman,² therefore people call him a “monk.” Because: one contemplates the body, one contemplates the precepts, one contemplates the mind, one contemplates wisdom,³ one is without fear, one has crossed over the flood of existence, one is free of all views and fear with respect to both existence and non-existence,⁴ and one dwells in the path of fearlessness — therefore people call him a

¹ Mhy. 419) *nyon mongs pa bcom pa = bhinnakleśa*. Is the term here a *bahuvrīhi*, meaning “one in whom the defilements are destroyed”? The expression here is a so-called folk etymology, with the *bhi-* of *bhinna* and the *k-* and *-ś-* of *kleśa* to account for *bhikṣu*. The same expression is found in “explanation” of *bhikṣu* in the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* (Wogihara 1932: 8.26), and it is quoted in PTSD s.v. *bhikkhu* as “one of several allegorical etymologies ... which occur frequently in the commentaries.”

² The list is a standard one, and the technical terms are, in order, *ātma-samjñā*, *sattva-*, *jīva-*, *poṣa-*, *puṭgala-*, *puruṣa-*, *strī-*, *dāraka-*, *dārikā-*. Compare the variants in the *Ratnacūḍa-sūtra* quoted at *Śikṣā-samuccaya* 236.15-16: *na punar atra kaścīd ātmabhāve satvo vā jīvo vā jantur vā poṣo vā puruṣo vā puṭgalo vā manuḥ vā yo jāyate vā jīryate vā cyavate votpadyate vā*; the *Ugradattapariprcchā*, quoted at *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 199.8-9: *nāsty atra kāye ātmā vā satvo vā jīvo vā poṣo vā puṭgalo vā manuḥ vā mānava vā*; KP §142; The formula as a whole does not seem to appear in the Nikāyas, but does in the *Niddesa*, for which see PTC s.v. *poṣa*, for examples.

³ Of these four terms, *kāya-bhāvanā*, *śīla-*, *citta-* and *prajñā-*, only the second and fourth are found in Chinese. This list was, however, already found above at I.3, and see the note there.

⁴ Mhy. 2417) *’byung ba dang ’jig pa la sred pa dang bral ba = vīta-trṣṇo bhavābhava*, allows us to suggest here **vīta-sarva-dṛṣṭi-bhayo bhavābhava*. The expression from “crossed over the flood of existence” to here is found in Chinese as follows: “crossed over the three existences (*bhavas*) and four floods (*oghas*), sees the faults of the existences and floods and is free of all existences and floods.”

“monk.”

II.2

If there is someone, Kāśyapa, who does not possess these characteristics but falsely claims “I am a monk, I am a monk,” rejecting zealous cultivation [of the path], I am not his teacher, nor likewise is he my disciple.

II.3

Evil monks, Kāśyapa, will to a great extent¹ bring about the destruction of this teaching of mine but, Kāśyapa, the ninety-five non-believers and all the rival schools are not able to bring about the destruction of this teaching of mine.² On

¹ I am not certain that *phal cher* here should be taken adverbially. Chinese has rather “many evil monks.” Should the Tibetan also be so understood?

² Probably the term translated here as “non-believer” is *pāṣaṇḍa* or *pāṣaṇḍika* (Mhy 3524), and “rival schools” *parapravādin* (Mhy. 2730). The usual translation of *pāṣaṇḍa* as “heretic” is not accurate, since the reference is not to heretical Buddhists but rather to those who do not follow Buddhism. (For a few remarks on *pāṣaṇḍa*, see Halbfass 1988: 191-2, and 514 n. 91.) Oda 435b says there are two types of classifications of 95 or 96 non-buddhist views 外道 (the classification of 95 is mentioned only very much in passing by Mochizuki 911b-913a, and 96 not at all). Oda refers to many examples, of which we may quote a few and add a few more: 95 views: *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* 大般涅槃經 T. 375 (XII) 668a4: 常說一切外學九十五種皆趣惡道. The *Wenshushili niepan-jing* 文殊師利般涅槃經 T. 463 (XIV) 480c16 refers to 95 theses of brahmins: 諸婆羅門九十五種. See also Zhi Yi’s 智顗 *Pusa jieyishu* 菩薩戒義疏 T. 1811 (XL) 579a29 which says there are 95 types of evil non-Buddhists: 外道惡人即九十五種. 96: *Ekottarāgama* T. 125 (20.4) (II) 651c29. *Gaṇḍavyūha* (Suzuki and Idzumi 1949: 181.14-17): “I will go everywhere, Gentle son, to mature those beings, nonbelievers in this land [Jambudvīpa = India] obstinately attached to the ninety-six varieties of items of wrong speculation.” *ye ’pīme kulaputra jambudvīpe saṇṇavatiyo pāṣaṇḍā vividhadrṣṭigatābhiniṣṭās tatrāpy ahaṃ sarvatrāgacchāmi vividhadrṣṭigatasaktānāṃ sattvānāṃ paripācanatāyai*. *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 79b29; 228b15, 25; 325c11; 349b22 (62 views at line 26!), etc. The **Sārvāstivādinayavibhāṣā* (T. 1440 [XXIII] 536a22-26; I owe the reference to Wang 1988: 125, note 25) explains (or rationalizes) as follows: There were six non-Buddhist teachers [in canonical accounts]. “Each teacher had fifteen types of teaching, and he gave each disciple a different teaching. The disciples accepted and practiced them, and each evolved a different view (**drṣṭi*). In this manner one teacher produced fifteen types of views; the teacher’s [own] teaching (**dharma*) was different from those of his disciples, so teacher and disciples have sixteen views [together]. In this way the six

the contrary, it is those deluded people with minds not given to profound concentration¹ who arise from [within] this [very] teaching of mine who will destroy my teaching.² By way of example, Kāśyapa, the flesh of a dead lion, the king of animals, cannot be eaten even by some wild beast or bird, but those worms born out of the very carcass of that lion eat the flesh of the lion, the king of animals. In this fashion, Kāśyapa, those greedy fools, overcome by passion,³ of illicit view, of uncomprehending mind, feeble, liars, who arise from out of this very teaching of mine will destroy my teaching.⁴

teachers have ninety-six views.” The *Āṅgulinālika* (a Mahāyāna text) T. 120 (II) 541c3-6 also refers to 96 different views. Yijing’s account of pilgrims who travelled to India also refers to 96 (T. 2066 [LI] 6a9, Wang 1988: 114, and 125 note 25, and Chavannes 1894: 91, and note 2), as does the account of Faxian (T. 2085 [LI] 860c19, 861a8-9, Legge 1886: 60, 62). An eleventh century commentary on the *Dharma-guptaka-vinaya*, the 四分律行事鈔資持記 T. 1805 (XL) 165b4, refers to the idea that there are 95 外道 plus Buddhism, for 96.

Another account, the *locus classicus* of which is in the *Brahmajāla-sutta* (DN i.39), places the number instead at 62. See for instance BHSD s.v. *drṣṭikṛta*, referring to SP 48.6, *dvāṣaṣṭidṛṣṭikṛta niś[r]ayitvā*; the Central Asian text in Toda 1981: 28 reads *dvāṣaṣṭidṛṣṭigatam āśrayitvā*. The *Upāya-kaṣālyasūtra* in the MRK also gives the number of heresies as 62 (T. 310 [38] XI 599b25).

¹ In its positive form the term *nges par sems pa*, refers to *nidhyaptacitta*, which I have translated as “with profound concentration of thought” in VI.5, below. See BHSD s.v. *nidhyapta*, et seq.

² A passage in the *Samyutta Nikāya* says the following: “The earth element does not destroy the True Teaching (*saddhamma*), nor does the water element ... nor does the fire element ... nor does the wind element destroy the True Teaching. Rather, right here [within the community] there arise deluded people and they destroy the True Teaching.” SN ii.224,22-26 (XVI.13.8-12): *na kho kassapa pathaviḍhātu saddhammam antarahāpeti // na āpodhātu / pe / na tejodhātu / pe / na vayodhātu saddhammam antarahāpeti // atha kho idheva te uppajjanti moghāpurisā ye imaṃ saddhammam antarahāpeti*. The simile, of course, does not appear, but otherwise the passage seems to have exactly the same intent as those just quoted. [The term *moghāpurisā* is not completely clear. First, the reading should be emended either to *moghāpurisā*, or treated as two words in apposition: *moghā purisā*. Second, although *mogha* is defined in both Pāli and Sanskrit as “empty, vain,” it is also equivalent to *moha*, which means deluded or foolish. I do not see how a rendering such as that of C.A.F. Rhys Davids 1922: 152, “futile men,” makes any sense, and have adopted the understanding of *mogha* as = *moha*.] Chinese parallels to the SN passage are found in the *Samyuktāgama* T. 99 (906) (II) 226c10-13 and T. 100 (121) (II) 419b28-c4. Both of these versions clarify that the evil members of the community will “say that dharma is non-dharma, non-dharma is dharma, vinaya is non-vinaya, non-vinaya is vinaya, etc.” and this will cause the gradual disappearance of the Buddha’s True Teaching (*saddharma*) and its replacement with the Semblance Teaching (像法).

³ Compare Mhy. 180, in which a couple of the same terms appear: *kye ma 'jig rten gnas pa 'di ni brkam zhing 'dod pas zil gyis non pa ste chog mi shes shing gzhan gyi nor la 'phrog pa = lubdho lobhā-bhibhūto vatāyaṃ lokasamniveśo 'trptaḥ paravittāpahāri*.

⁴ The Chinese translation has it a bit differently: “Kāśyapa. There will arise out of my teaching such evil monks, greedy for profits, who conceal their greed, who do not destroy evil things and do not

II.4

If one possesses four qualities, Kāśyapa, he should be known as an evil monk.

Which four?

- 1) Lust, and
- 2) Hate, and
- 3) Delusion, and
- 4) Self-conceit. Those four.¹

II.5

Another four. Which four?

cultivate good things, who are not free of malicious language.”

The simile is found elsewhere: Oda 704a-b refers to the *Lianhuamian-jing*: “For example, when a lion dies all beings whether of the sky, the soil, the water or the land do not dare to eat the flesh of that lion’s body. Rather, from the very flesh of that lion itself are born worms which consume the lion’s flesh. Ānanda. This Buddha teaching of mine is not something which can be destroyed by others. It is rather evil monks within my teaching who like a poisoned thorn will destroy the Buddha teaching which I have accumulated through the practice of ascetic penances over three immeasurable aeons.” 蓮華面經 T 386 (XII) 1072c23-28: 譬如 師子命絕身死 若空若地若水若陸所有衆生不敢食彼師子身肉。唯師子身自生諸虫還自噉食師子之肉。阿難。我之佛法非餘能壞是我法中諸惡比丘猶如毒刺破我三阿僧祇劫積行勤苦所集佛法。On the text see Yamada 1955 and 1959: 567-80.

See also the 仁王般若波羅蜜經 T. 245 (VIII) 833b29-c7: “Great king! When the dharma is no longer in the world, there will be monks, disciples of the four groups [bhikṣus, bhikṣuṇīs, upāsakasa, upāsikās], kings (and ministers) who perform many unlawful deeds, transgress against the Buddha, the teaching and the community, perform great unlawful deeds, perform many sins, illegalities and violations of the discipline and bind up monks in the fashion of a prisoner. At such a time the teaching will decay and not remain long. Great king! After my death, in future days there will be in the world four types of disciples, various petty kings, princes, princelets and these protectors and defenders of the Three Jewels will turn and destroy the Three Jewels. Similarly, it is worms in the body of a lion which themselves devour the lion, [so it is monks within the community who destroy it] not non-Buddhists.” 大王 法末世時有諸比丘四部弟子國王 (S, Y, M add 大臣) 多作非法之行橫與佛法衆僧作大非法作諸罪過非法非律繫縛比丘如獄囚法當爾之時法滅不久。大王 我滅度後未來世中四部弟子諸小國王太子王子乃是住持護三寶者轉更滅破三寶 如師子身中虫自食師子非外道也 ... etc.

¹ The list is of course *rāga*, *dveṣa*, *moha*, plus *asmimāna*. On the last see BHSD s.v.

- 1) Arrogance,¹ and
- 2) Impudence,² and
- 3) Being [noisy] like a raven,³ and
- 4) Using obscene language.⁴ Those four.

II.6

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Frivolity,⁵ and
- 2) Conceit, and
- 3) Desire for gain, and
- 4) Desire for the illicit. Those four.

II.7

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Deceit,⁶ and
- 2) Cunning, and

¹ **stambha*, Mhy. 7339.

² **mukhara*, Mhy 2481. Or perhaps garrulousness, scurrilousness? BHSD s.v. See the note to I.4 (20), above.

³ See MW *kākarava*: crying out like a crow, cowardly.

⁴ Chinese: “committing the fault of not taking care in speech.”

⁵ *auddhatya*. See BHSD s.v. *auddhatya*. As Edgerton points out, the term means “*frivolity*, in the double sense of *amusement*, *idle sport*, and *mental indolence*, *lack of seriousness of mind*.” It is the second of these senses which is more to the fore here, as the Chinese rendering “unsteadiness” emphasizes.

⁶ **jihma* (Mhy. 7324).

- 3) Improper livelihood,¹ and
- 4) Speaking of insignificant matters. Those four.

II.8

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Not to acknowledge what was done [for one by others],² and
- 2) To deprecate what was done [for one by others], and
- 3) Not to recall what was previously done [for one by others], and
- 4) To insult one's friends. Those four.

II.9

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Destruction of the gift of faith, and
- 2) Not upholding the precepts, and
- 3) Contempt for the monastic disciplinary rule, and
- 4) Not upholding the discipline. Those four.

II.10

Another four. Which four?

¹ Probably this does not refer to the category of the five *mithyājīva*, but rather to various types of improper livelihood in general.

² Here and in the following the additions in brackets are based on the Chinese translation.

- 1) [Holding] the doctrine [that there exists] a self, and
- 2) [Holding] the doctrine [that there exists] a sentient being, and
- 3) [Holding] the doctrine [that there exists] a life-essence, and
- 4) [Holding] the doctrine [that there exists] a person.¹ Those four.

II.11

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Not honoring the Buddha, and
- 2) Not honoring the Teaching, and
- 3) Not honoring the Community, and
- 4) Not honoring the [three] teachings.² Those four.

II.12

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Not delighting in the communion of the order,³ and
- 2) Not obtaining delight in the monastery,⁴ and
- 3) Delighting in garrulous association with others, and

¹ We have here of course *ātma-*, *sattva-*, *jīva-* and *pudgala-vāda*.

² It is not certain what *bslab* = **śikṣā* means here. See BHSD s.v. Chinese 戒 suggests the meaning morality or even discipline. I have conjectured that the reference is to the three “instructions,” the *adhiśīla*, *adhicitta* and *adhiprajñā*. The parallelism with Buddha, Teaching and community, however, escapes me.

³ *dge 'dun 'thun pa* = *saṃghasāmagrī*. See BHSD s.v. *sāmagrī*.

⁴ Monastery is *vihāra*. Chinese has: “not delighting in solitary places.”

- 4) Propounding the ideas of the Materialists. Those four.

II.13

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Desire for acquisitions, and
- 2) Desire for fame, and
- 3) Desire for friends,¹ and
- 4) Not obtaining joy in the Teaching.² Those four.

II.14

Another four. Which four?

- 1) To be possessed by Māra, and
- 2) To be overcome by Māra, and
- 3) To be full of torpor and drowsiness,³ and
- 4) Not to dwell in the saintly attitudes.⁴ Those four.

II.15

Another four. Which four?

¹ Or, relatives and friends. Compare *bśhes gnyen* = *mitra*. Chinese 求多知識, probably just “searching for many friends.”

² **dharmaprāmodya*°. The appropriate Chinese rendering of this item is found at II.14.4.

³ **styānamiddha*. See BHSD s.v.

⁴ The appropriate Chinese rendering is found at II.13 (4). The “saintly attitudes” translates *āryavaśā*.

- 1) To adorn the body, although it is rotten,¹ and
- 2) To be afflicted by defilements, and
- 3) Turning one's back on nirvāṇa, and
- 4) To not have obtained the fruit [of the śramaṇa]. Those four.

II.16

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Being burned by burning desire for lust,² and
- 2) Being burned by burning desire for hatred, and
- 3) Being burned by burning desire for delusion, and
- 4) Being burned by burning desire for all defilements. Those four.

II.17

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Dwelling in a bad path, to be one who does not see arisal, and

¹ Chinese: "to rot / decay in the Buddhadharma," or "to cause the Buddhadharma to rot"? Either way, the possible connection with the sense of the Tibetan translation is hard to locate. In the following, item 2 in Tibetan is rendered by Chinese 3, but item 3 does not seem to correspond to Chinese 2, "to have a mind given to deceit."

² See BHSD s.v. *paridāgha*, which offers the meanings "ardent desire" and "torment, anguish." Edgerton cites references to the form *kāmaparidāgha* and its Pāli equivalents (we might add in Tibetan *Sandhinirmocana* II.3). Our passage, however, clearly refers to *rāga*, *dveṣa* and *moha*, along with *sarvakkleśa*. For the first three, at least, see *Udāna* 32.25-26. The Buddha surveying the world sees many beings being burned: "being burned by many burning desires, by lusts, by hatreds, by delusions." *anekehi ca pariāhehi paridayhamāne rāgajehi pi dosajehi pi mohajehi pi*. [Should we read with MS A °*rajehi* for °*jehi*?]

- 2) Being greedy, having the nature of not sharing with others, and
- 3) Desiring to possess everything, and [so] being unsatisfied, and
- 4) Being unsated, but being devoid of energy for learning.¹ Those four.

II.18

Another four. Which four?

- 1) To descend from darkness to [greater] darkness,² and
- 2) To descend from delusion to [greater] delusion, and
- 3) To have an illicit view because of being ensnared by wrong notions,³ and
- 4) Being bound by the fetters of saṃsāra because one has shut the doors of nirvāṇa.⁴ Those four.

¹ Chinese has: “1) To engage in sexual play and to not know one is sinning. 2) Not being content, although one is very learned. 3) Not being content with what one possesses.” 4) = Tibetan 2.

² This image is standard, not only in Buddhist materials but even in the Upaniṣads, although the usage and meaning may not be the same. See *Īśopaniṣad* 9 = *Brhadāranyakopaniṣad* 4.4.10 (and see also *Īśa* 12). *andhaṃ tamaḥ praviṣanti yo 'dviyāṃ upāsate / tato bhūya iva te tamo ya u vidyāyāṃ ratāḥ //*. “They enter blind darkness who are intent on ignorance, and darkness which seems even greater than that enter those who delight in knowledge.” For a Buddhist usage of the image, see the *Anūnatvāpurnatva-nirdeśaparivarta* quoted in the *Ratnagotravibhāga* (Johnston 1950: 28.3-4; the sūtra passage is T. 688 [XVI] 467c23, differing slightly): *tān ahaṃ śāriputra tamasa tamo 'ntaram andhakārān mahāndhakāra-gāminas tamobhūyiṣṭhā itī vadāmi*, “Śāriputra, I say that they [people who have certain wrong views, specified in the sūtra] go from one darkness to another darkness, from obscurity to greater obscurity, that they are fundamentally characterized by darkness.”

³ Chinese has “not seeing the noble truths and producing much confusion.”

⁴ In the *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 206a12-13 = *Traité* (Lamotte 1944-80): 1210, it is stated that there are three doors to the city of Nirvāṇa, these being emptiness, signlessness and wishlessness. This may or may not be the image intended here.

II.19

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Deceitful behavior of body, and
- 2) Deceitful behavior of speech, and
- 3) Deceitful behavior of mind,¹ and
- 4) Deceitful behavior of the [four] modes of deportment.² Those four.

II.20

In that regard, deceitful behavior of body is deceitful behavior of walking slowly; deceitful behavior of lowering one's head;³ deceitful behavior of gazing only a yoke's length ahead;⁴ deceitful behavior of wearing [monastic] garb well; deceitful behavior is like being a forest dweller while not pursuing the good qualities of the forest dweller; deceitful behavior is like accepting alms without dispelling the idea [that one will thus attain] fame; deceitful behavior is like wearing refuse rags without the accompanying shame and modesty; deceitful

¹ See BHSD s.v. kuhana. *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 268.1-3 quotes *Ratnameghasūtra*: "Thus he does not behave deceitfully in terms of body ... speech ... mind." *evam kāyakuhanām na karoti / katham vākkukhanām na karoti / ... katham na cittakuhanām karoti /*. Bendall's note quotes the Tibetan as *tshul 'chos*, and refers to *Anargharāghava* IV st. 11.

² See KP §123: "Those modes of deportment are feigned with deceit and boasting [about his spiritual accomplishments]." *spyod lam de dag kyang tshul 'chos pa dang / kha gsag gis yongs su brtags pa yin te / = te cāsyeryāpathāḥ kuhanalapanatayā kalpitā bhavanti*. The four modes of deportment are walking, standing, sitting, lying down. See BHSD s.v. iryapatha. (It is perhaps more standard to translate *kuhana* with "hypocrisy," but I think that fundamentally the term refers to a type of trickery or deceit; one fools not oneself [which is hypocritical], but others, and for the sake of a certain end; this is deceit.)

³ Mhy. 7125 *adhomukhaḥ*; Chinese not looking left or right.

⁴ See Mhy. 8539: *gnya' shing gang tsam du blta ba = yugamātradarśinaḥ*. *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 167.15 quotes from the *Ratnamegha* the form *yugamātraprekṣikayā*. Apparently the word in the Mhy.'s shape is not in BHSD. Pāli seems to have equivalents for both terms, according to PTSD s.v. yuga.

behavior is like dwelling near a mountain and near a tree without understanding dependent co-origination; deceitful behavior is like trying to obtain decocted medicine but not trying to obtain the immortal medicine of the Teaching.¹ This is what we mean by “deceitful behavior of body.”²

II.21

In this regard, what is deceitful behavior of speech? Saying ‘such-and-such a person knows me, such-and-such a person invited me to a feast,’ or ‘I obtain what I desire, and obtain it with honor. I obtain what is good. I obtain things many times. I am very learned. I uphold the precepts and am of good character.’³ I am worthy to be invited. I am, again, capable of establishing an opposing position.⁴

¹ The four items just listed refer to the four reliances, *nīśaya*, listed for example in Mhy. 8669-73. In Pāli the four *nissaya* is a common classification. Childers s.v. *nissayo* is better here than PTSD. The last item, decocted medicine, is *pūtimuktabhaiṣajya* (Mhy. 8673 *sman bkus ta bor ba*). See BHSD s.v. *pūtimukta*; *Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya* (Roth 1970) §51, 64; Oda 1917: 1211c-12a; Vin. i.58.20 (*Mahāvagga* I.30.4); MN i.316,24-34; *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* 十誦律 T. 1435 (XXIII) 156c24. See also Yijing’s diary, Takakusu 1896: 139. I have not yet run across other examples of the striking imagery we have here, especially in the last item.

² We may compare here the passage in the *Ekottarāgama* 增壹阿含經 T. 125 (II) 634a24-29 (≈ AN ii.106-107 [§IV.106]), pointed out already in a somewhat different context by Ōno Hōdō 1954: 100-101: “What sort of people are ‘raw / immature’ 生 but imitate the ‘cooked / matured’ 熟? There are some people who wander to and fro and do not move abruptly and carelessly. The way their eyes look [at things] is always in accord with the teachings. Wearing their robes and taking their bowls they wander in accord with the teaching. They look at the ground and do not gaze right or left. But they violate the precepts and do not follow the correct practice. They are not true śramaṇas but rather imitation śramaṇas. They are not followers of the practice of purity (*brahmacarya*) but claim themselves to be followers of the practice of purity. They destroy the true teachings. They are the seed which corrupts the root. These people are called ‘raw / immature’ but counterfeiting the ‘cooked / matured.’”

³ See KP §11 for *śīlavatī* and *kalyāṇadharmā* side by side, those who uphold the precepts, and are of good character.

⁴ Mhy. 4448, *samādhāna* or 6593 *pratīvidhāna*? BHSD s.v. *samādhāna* says: “acc. to Tib. lan gdab pa, making answer, reply: ... prob. in sense of refutation of an opponent’s argument by way of establishing one’s own view....” Still, I am not clear on the meaning. Chinese has: 我善問答。我能順法相。我能逆法相。 “I answer questions well. I can [recite?] the teachings in their forward order and I can [recite them?] in their reverse order.”

Being endowed with dignity, I have fortune and I have power.¹ I am wise in the teachings which concern the ascertainment of meanings.² Such-and-such a person speaks in such-and-such a way to me, and I speaking in such-and-such a way to him revile him and cause him to lose confidence.³ I please the audience, I receive their congratulations, I receive clothing from them,⁴ and I am invited to come again.’ Whatever sort of vain talk, Kāśyapa, comes from among those whose minds are not given to profound concentration is all deceitful behavior of speech. This applies to those who are unworthy, but does not apply to those who are worthy. This is what we mean by “deceitful behavior of speech.”

II.22

In that regard, Kāśyapa, what is deceitful behavior of mind? Imagining in one’s mind that it is appropriate that one receive robes and bowls, but still verbally saying “I need nothing,” and desiring in one’s mind to obtain [something] but still saying with words that one has few desires — this is what we mean by “deceitful behavior of mind.”

II.23

In that regard it is said:

¹ Chinese omits this sentence.

² **arthaviniścaya*-. Chinese has: “I comprehend meaning and non-meaning in relation to all dharmas.” For a discussion of the meaning of the term *arthaviniścaya* in the context of its appearance as a text title, see Samtani 1971: 57-60.

³ Chinese has the sentence as: “if another asks me in such-and-such a way I can answer him in such-and-such a way, and having answered I reduce him to silence.”

⁴ Chinese omits this clause.

To think in one's mind "Wouldn't it be nice if I got [gifts]?"

[While] saying aloud "I have no needs at all" —

One who speaks in that way with a mind that is not sincere

Will never ever obtain happiness. {a}

One whose thoughts are [characterized by] deceitful behavior of mind,

Who has the idea that his speech will beguile the gods,

The nāgas, and those possessed of the Divine Eye, will never become

pure;

All the Tathāgatas know him. {b}

II.24

Thus, Kāśyapa, whichever unrighteous¹ monk of this type, who practices evil, wrong² practices, will go [in his subsequent rebirths] to hell-being status, or to birth as an animal, or to the realm of the king of the dead.³

The Chapter on the Monk; The Second.

¹ **adharmika.*

² Perhaps **anācāraka*? The rendering "wrong" may be too weak in the present context.

³ On Yama, see Wayman 1959.

The English Translation: Chapter Three

<The Outcaste Śramaṇa>

III.1

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the outcaste-like śramaṇa?¹ By way of example, Kāśyapa, the outcaste is one who always frequents charnel grounds.² He hopes [to find] a corpse, looks at living beings with eyes devoid of friendliness, and takes delight in [encountering] a corpse.³ In a similar way, Kāśyapa, the outcaste-like śramaṇa also is one who is always eager to find the house of a friend and the house of one who gives alms. Then, subsisting on the profit and honor [he obtains], he does not incite those householders to undertake the Teaching and the Discipline, but he becomes familiar with them for the sake of profit and not for the sake of [acquiring] the goal;⁴ he is without a loving heart and he always hopes for profit. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the outcaste-like śramaṇa.”

¹ See the discussion of the *caṇḍāla* in the Introduction.

² *Manusmṛti* X.39 discusses the off-spring of a Niṣāda woman and a Caṇḍāla man, who is called an Antyāvasāyin and who is *śmaśānagocara*, frequenting burning grounds, going about in places for burning the dead: *niṣādastrī tu caṇḍālāt putram antyāvasāyinaṃ / śmaśānagocaraṃ sūte vāhyānām api garhitam //*

³ I have inserted the words in brackets in line with the Chinese translation. Tibetan *shi ba* usually means just “dead,” but in AKB *mṛtakalpa*, “almost dead,” is rendered *shi ba dang 'dra ba* and, by Paramārtha, 譬如死屍, “like a corpse.” See Hirakawa 1973, 1977, 1978, s.v.

⁴ One of the Brahmanical Saṃnyāsa Upaniṣads, *Maitreya Upaniṣad* 2.3.10 (Schrader 1912: 117.1-2) says: *dravyārtham annavastrārtham yaḥ pratiṣṭhārtham eva vā / saṃnyased ubhayabhraṣṭaḥ sa muktiṃ nāptum arhati //*. Olivelle (1992: 163) translates: “He who renounces for the sake of wealth, food, clothes, or celebrity, falls from both paths and is unable to attain release.” Schrader’s commentary (427.6) explains *ubhayabhraṣṭaḥ gārhaṣṭhyāt saṃnyāsāc ca bhraṣṭaḥ*, in other words he is no longer a householder but not a renouncer either (see Olivelle note 17).

III.2

By way of example, Kāśyapa: The outcaste deserves to be forever spurned by guild-chiefs, householders, ministers, vassal princes, brahmins, kṣatriyas, townsmen and country-folks.¹ Recognizing the outcaste, even those far away spurn him at a distance.² In a similar way, Kāśyapa, the outcaste-like śramaṇa too deserves to be spurned by monks, nuns, upāsakas and upāsikās who uphold the precepts and are virtuous. Having recognized that the outcaste-like śramaṇa practices evil deeds and breaks the precepts, even those far away spurn him at a distance.³

III.3

By way of example, Kāśyapa: High class people do not touch and do not use an outcaste's flag⁴ or garments, everything used by him. Similarly, Kāśyapa,

¹ See BHSD s.v. koṭṭarājan, and the stock phrases quoted there. See also s.v. naigama.

² The exact sense of *thag ring po ba* is not clear to me. Chinese 遠離不欲共作知識, "stay away and do not desire to become friends with them." Probably Tibetan should be understood in the sense of *dūra*^o, distant,

³ Compare the passage in the *Anguttara Nikāya* (AN i.126,14-22): "Here, monks, there is a person who is a precept breaker, of evil behavior, impure, of vile conduct, who acts secretly, who while not a śramaṇa claims to be a śramaṇa, who while not a keeper of the practice of purity claims to be a keeper of the practice of purity, who is internally putrid, internally leaking, internally of a rotten nature. A person such as this, monks, is to be shunned, he is not to be frequented, not to be associated with, not to be attended upon. Why? Because, monks, even though one does not give consideration to the wrong speculation of such a person, still an evil reputation spreads about, that one is a man who has evil friends, evil companions, evil intimates." *idha bhikkhave ekacco puggalo dussilo hoti pāpadhammo asucisaṅkassa-rasamācāro patichannakammanto assamaṇo samaṇapatiṇṇo abrahmacārī brahmacāripaṭiṇṇo antopūti avassuto kasambujāto. evarūpo bhikkhave puggalo jigucchitabbo na sevitaḥ na bhajitabbo na payirupāsitaḥ. taṃ kissa hetu. kiñcāpi bhikkhave evarūpassa puggalassa na diṭṭhānugatiṃ āpajjati atha kho naṃ pāpako kittisaddo abbhuggacchati pāpamitto purisapuggalo pāpasahāyo pāpasampavaṅko ti.*

⁴ Zhang et al. 1985 defines *kha phyis* as a cotton handkerchief or napkin, *gdong phyi byed kyi ras*. This is obscure to me, but I wonder if this refers to the sign the outcaste must display warning those who catch sight of him that they should stay away. The Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāsi* has: "good people absolutely are not pleased by the robes, food and everything used by a caṇḍāla, and do not use it." I cannot suggest a clear resolution of the problem now.

because the outcaste-like śramaṇa's bowl, robes, and everything used by him is sought for through improper livelihood, sought for through injuring body and mind, those who uphold the precepts and are virtuous do not touch and do not use them.

III.4

By way of example, Kāśyapa: An outcaste holds up his 'flag' and goes to another's home in a timid, shrinking way.¹ Similarly, Kāśyapa, the outcaste-like śramaṇa too pays homage to the Tathāgata's stūpa in a timid, shrinking way. He goes about in the assembly in a timid, shrinking way. He goes to a monastery, rest-house and another's home in a timid, shrinking way. He walks, sits, lies down in a timid, shrinking way. Thus, Kāśyapa, all his means of deportment, which conceal his sinful timid, shrinking actions, are imagined based on the unreal.²

It is probable that what Tibetan has as "touch," *reg*, represents some form of *√sprś*, and that this was understood by Chinese in line with the meaning of *phāsu* as 愛樂 "delight in, be pleased with." This would account for the difference in their renderings, and would further suggest that the text available to the Chinese translators was in some form of Middle Indic, rather than Sanskrit. (For a detailed discussion on the term *phāsu*, see Caillat 1960, 1961.)

¹ The Tibetan *zhum zhum* is defined (Zhang et al. 1985) as movement such as that of a cat stalking a bird or mouse, but virtually without question we should interpret it instead in a weak rather than a strong sense. It is possible that we should imagine a form such as **līna / *dīna* here. See BHSD s.v. *alina* and *līna*, and Wogihara 1964-74 s.v. *alina*, *adīna*, *dīna*, *līna*. *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 20.15 (quoting the *Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa*) has: *līnaṃ cittāṃ bodhisattvānāṃ na vidyate*, Tibetan (Derge 15a7) ... *zhum pa'i sems med*, Chinese T. 1636 (XXXII) 80a15 菩薩無懈怠心. (懈怠 usually renders *kausīdya*, "laziness.") (The *Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa* is the *Bodhisattva-prātimokṣaśāstra* Ōtani 914, Tōhoku 248. The quotations in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have been identified and studied by Fujita Kōkan 1988. Fujita 1988: 124 translates *līnaṃ cittāṃ* [which he writes in compound!] as 消沈した心, "dejected.")

² I am not sure of this rendering. *yongs su brtags pa* surely refers to **parikalpita* or a related form, but what is *rung ba ma yin pa*? Could it stand for **abhūta*?

III.5

By way of example, Kāśyapa: The mind of the outcaste is not set on birth in a good destiny. Why? Through the fault of his very own actions. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the mind of the outcaste-like śramaṇa too is not set on doing the actions necessary to go to a good destiny, and so that other world is lost, and there is no obstacle to his dwelling in the three bad destinies. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the outcaste-like śramaṇa.”

III.6

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the putrid śramaṇa?¹ By way of example, Kāśyapa: From the excellent drink which is fit for the king the best part² is scooped off [for him to drink], and the remainder becomes putrid and impure, and is not fit to be tasted. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the putrid śramaṇa too is deprived of the taste of the cream of the best teaching, fetid, fit [only] to be thrown away, defiled, cunning and deceitful, full of the stench of broken precepts, deprived of the fragrance of the precepts, soiled by the odor of defilements. Wherever he goes he is concerned with his own benefit, but not with the benefit of others.³ This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the putrid śramaṇa.”

¹ It is possible that the Sanskrit equivalent here is **pūti*(ka). Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 170a) writes *puṭima* (the other associated forms are obscure to me). But note that AN i.72,8 (no Chinese equivalent?) discusses two types of assembly: *parisakasaṭo ca parisamaṇḍo ca*, the “dregs” assembly and the assembly of the “cream” or best portion. The former term is also found at SP 44.11 (Tibetan *sn̥yigs ma*). This expression (and see the following note) suggest that the *Ratnarāṣi* may be referring to *kaṣaṭa*(f)a rather than **pūti*.

² Probably *maṇḍa*. See Hōbōgirin 640-51 (Daigo 醍醐, by Anna Seidel), in which the imagery etc. is discussed in detail, but without any reference to our particular example.

³ Chinese has: “Wherever he goes he cannot benefit himself and he does not benefit others.”

III.7

By way of example, Kāśyapa, the “putrid” is like this: What is eaten, drunk, or chewed on¹ is excreted, and that putrefies and is evil smelling; for all high class people it is [only] fit to be thrown away. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the putrid śramaṇa too is like excrement, and since [his] behaviors of body, speech and mind are impure noble people should spurn him. This is what we mean by “the putrid śramaṇa.”

III.8

By way of example, Kāśyapa: A putrid seed cannot grow out of the earth. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the putrid śramaṇa too is not produced in the Buddha’s teaching, the noble Teaching is not a possible seed of liberation, and the fruit [of the śramaṇa] will not be obtained. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the putrid śramaṇa.”

III.9

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the box-like² śramaṇa? By way of example, Kāśyapa: Although one may cleanse a box on the outside, the inside may still be filled with various impurities. Similarly, the box-like śramaṇa too has the appearance of a

¹ Compare Mhy 7040: *zos pa dang 'thungs pa dang 'chos pa dang myangs pa rnam legs par bde bar 'ju = aśītapīṭakhādītāsvādītāni samyak sukhena paripākāṃ gacchanti.*

² Mhy. 5891 *karaṇḍaka*. Is there some sort of verbal play here between *karaṇḍaka* and *kuraṇṭaka* in the following section? See below in the notes as well for the term *kāraṇḍava*, rubbish barley śramaṇa.

śramaṇa, and externally he practices cleanliness, but inside he is thoroughly filled with lust, hate and delusion. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the box-like śramaṇa.”

III.10

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the kuraṇṭaka-like¹ śramaṇa? By way of example, Kāśyapa: If one looks at the color of the flowers called “kuraṇṭaka” they are agreeable, but if one touches them they are rough, they stink of dung-flies, and they stink of the root of the *śilabarka.² The wise do not touch flowers like that, do not pick them, do not smell them, but those who are foolish and do not know their defects pick flowers like that and smell them. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the

¹ Probably *kuraṇṭaka* or *karuntaka* or *kuruṇṭikā* (?), although Tibetan suggests a pronunciation *kuraṇḍāka*. The term appears not rarely, for example in the *Brhatsaṃhitā* XLIII.33. The *Bukkyō Daijii* 佛教大辭彙 II.891 discusses the word, giving 拘蘭茶, 俱蘭, and 紅色華. The word is referred to in the discussion of *Ratnakūṭa* vocabulary in the 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 (a Kashmiri who lived 737-820), T. 2128 (LIV) 400b10, and again 414b7 where it refers to a passage in the *Sūryagarbhasūtra* T. 397 (14) (XIII) 238a1. The latter sūtra passage is peculiar, however, in that it says 俱蘭華無色無香, in other words the **kuraṇṭaka* is colorless and odorless! I do not know how to reconcile this passage with our description. (The whole expression is completely missing in the Derge edition of the Tibetan translation of the *Sūryagarbhasūtra* Tōh. 257 *mdo sde*, za 104a3.) Also note that the 翻梵語 T. 2130 (LIV) 1050c5 lists the term from the *Ratnarāṣi* as 拘蘭茶華. The term *kuraṇṭaka* is discussed in Das 1988: 255 (note 4), 434, 460. There the identification with *barleria prionitis* L. is suggested. This plant is said to be a small spiny bush with plentiful buff colored flowers, yellow when fresh, and of bitter or sour taste. Das (or the appendix's author, G.J. Meulenbeld), as well as Prof. Michio Yano (personal communication), also refer to *celosia argentea* L., but Yano at least concludes that the identifications so far offered by specialists are all inconclusive. Nothing is mentioned in the sources I have seen about the odor of any of these plants, which must be a very noticeable feature of the plant being referred to here in the *Ratnarāṣi*. Notice also that further confusion is suggested by the entries in the *Amārakośa* and its commentaries. 4.74ab (Vānaśādhivarga) reads *tatra śoṇe kuravakas tatra pite kuraṇṭakāḥ*.

² I am puzzled by *shi la bar ka'i rtsa ba'i mnam ste* /; Chinese has no equivalent for the expression. It must refer, of course, to some plant with an odoriferous root; more than that I cannot say. I am just guessing, but perhaps **śilavarka* is Sanskrit (?). It does not appear to be a Tibetan word. In the context of the discussion of *kuraṇṭaka*, however, Das 1988: 460, 454 refers to *śitivāraka*, which should be investigated if only for its phonetic similarity to our problematic term. We might also consider the Sanskrit *śilā-vaḥkā*, but the discussion in the *Śabdakalpadrūma* s.v. makes this look unlikely. Should we compare Hindi *śilāvāk*?

kuraṇṭaka-like śramaṇa too possesses the color and physical appearance of a śramaṇa, but he is not gentle, he uses abusive language, he stinks of broken precepts, he is of wrong livelihood, wrong practice, and wrong view. The wise neither serve nor approach nor honor that kuraṇṭaka-like śramaṇa, but recognizing his character even those far away from him spurn him at a distance. Those who are foolish serve, approach, and honor the kuraṇṭaka-like śramaṇa, and like a fool holding a kuraṇṭaka flower in his hand they are well-disposed toward that [kuraṇṭaka-like śramaṇa]. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the kuraṇṭaka-like śramaṇa.”

III.11

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the thief-like śramaṇa?¹ By way of example, Kāśyapa: A man whose very nature is craftiness is always desiring, is overcome by lust, is not satisfied with his own possessions, wishes for the wealth of others, is fierce, violent, carries about swords and weapons, is shameless, without compassion, is always malicious and always has a malicious mind; when he enters a market-place or a village or a town or a city or a district, then this thought occurs to him: “Whatever is the mass of wealth of others, I hope to make it mine,” and thinking to grab it he prowls around secretly.² Similarly, Kāśyapa, the thief-like śramaṇa

¹ See I.12. Chinese has here “the śramaṇa who seeks profit.” See the Introduction for a discussion of thief-monks.

² Chinese has “always conceals his body and does not permit others to see him.” The Tibetan text is perhaps a bit problematic. It reads: *mkhyun bu mkhyun bur rgyu ba*. The term *'khyun bu* is defined (Zhang et al. 1985) as *chung ma min pa'i mdza' mo* = 情婦, adulteress, mistress. This is very dubious. On the other hand, *mkhyud pa* means to “hold in secret,” perhaps rendering *√guh?* Compare the term *gūdhacāra*, “going about secretly.” We may wonder, then, whether *mkhyun* and *mkhyud* are equivalent, or whether our text (all exemplars, without variants!) transmits an error.

too is always desiring, is overcome by lust, is not satisfied with his own possessions, and he wishes for the possessions of others. When he enters a market-place or a village or a town or a city or a district, then he enters for the sake of possessions, not for the sake of the Teaching. All of his modes of deportment too show him to be like a thief. Hiding [things] he is a concealer.¹ He thinks: "If other monks know that I have broken the precepts they will not allow it, and if they come to know, according to the recitation of the monastic disciplinary rule I will be banished,"² and so he is always afraid and fearful. Because he practices all his modes of deportment with guile, gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas will recognize that "A thief comes, a thief goes. A thief stands. A thief walks. A thief sits, lies down, puts on the religious robes. A thief goes to the village, comes out of the village. A thief eats. A thief drinks. A thief shaves his hair."

III.12

Thus, Kāśyapa, whatever his modes of deportment may be, since they are all unacceptable gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas will recognize that he is feigning,³ and having recognized that they will produce great compassion toward him,⁴ and scoffing they will insult him saying: "Oh no! It's amazing! Such evil

¹ See Mhy. 8492 *gopanam* = *sbed pa*, and 9062-65.

² Mhy. 8644 *pravāsanīya*, BHSD s.v. "action leading to banishment." Pāli *pabbājaniya*. Chinese contains the technical term in a sentence: 驅我出於善比丘, "eject me from the [group of] good monks." According to Nakamura 1981: 273b there are two basic terms, 驅出 *kushū* and 驅擯 *kuhin*, while Oda 1917: 147b gives 應減擯 *ōmetsuhin*. Mochizuki 1932-36 has a discussion s.v. *hinzui* 擯出 4332c-4333c, in which he lists even more synonyms and gives detailed information.

³ Compare the expression in the KP §123: *te asyeryāpathāḥ kuhanalapanatayā kalpitā bhavaṃti*, "those modes of deportment are feigned with deceit and boasting [about his spiritual accomplishments]."

⁴ Up until here the Chinese reads: "Kāśyapa. Gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas will know this fool in his going, coming, all his behaviors, and having seen him ... (they will scoff etc.)."

monks as this will destroy the teaching of the Blessed One Śākyamuni.” Gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas, however, greatly honor those who uphold the precepts and are virtuous, saying: “These [people] understand the teachings.” If, Kāśyapa, the thief-like śramaṇa feels aversion for renunciation in this teaching, and he does not produce even one thought devoid of lust, it goes without saying that the attainment of the fruit [of the śramaṇa is beyond him], and he has no place [here].¹ This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the thief-like śramaṇa.”

III.13

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the weed² monk? By way of example, Kāśyapa:

¹ Chinese understands the last clause as: “there is absolutely no chance that he might obtain it.” It is possible that Tibetan *gnas med do*, which I am not certain I have correctly understood, is intended to render **aniketa*. The term *aniketa* is difficult, and the dictionary meaning of “homeless” doesn’t make much sense here. Moreover, generally speaking the word appears to have a positive sense, which surely cannot be the case here. Régamey 1938b: 87 (166) translates *aniketa* “placeless,” quoting the *Kīrtimālā* commentary to the *Samādhirāja* as *gnas med pa ni gzung ba’i gnas med pa’i phyir ro*, “placeless, because having no attainable place.” This in itself is not absolutely clear, but might be suggestive.

² Note that sections III.13 and 14 are reversed in order in the Chinese translation. The term *shin te ma* appears in Mhy. 7635 (correctly in the new edition): *shin te (ma) med pa’am snyigs me med pa = niṣpalguṃ*. (BHSD s.v. *niṣpula* is thus to be deleted.) This is confirmed by the definition found in the *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* (Zhang et al. 1985): 1) *nyam chung ba* 衰弱, 無力 [weak, feeble]; 2) *snyigs ma* 沈澱, 濁 [impurity, taint]. The primary sense of *palgu* is “worthless, insignificant,” and Pāli *pheggu*, apparently the equivalent term, means soft or inferior wood (opposed to *sāra*, hard pith. Cf. Vedic *phalgvā*). But this is not the only possible identification.

The Tibetan *shin te ma* occurs in SP 39.3-4: Tibetan: *nga’i ’khor shin te ma med par gyur te / shā ri’i bu snyigs po ma yin pa med par gyur la dad pa’i snying po la gnas te* Sanskrit: Gilgit: *niṣpulāvā me śāriputra pariṣad<am> apagataphalgu śuddhā sāre pratiṣṭhitā*. Kashgar: *niṣpalāpā me śāradvatīputra pariṣat apalāpā hy apagataphalgu śuddhā sāre pratiṣṭhitā* Chinese: Kumārajīva T. 262 (IX) 7a12-13 has, laconically, 我今此衆無復枝葉純有貞實 (Kubo and Yuyama 1991: 27: “My assembly here is free of useless twigs and leaves; only the pure essence remains.”). The translations of Dharmarakṣa T. 263 (IX) 69b23 have been studied by Karashima (1992: 47, 286). He reports (p. 286) the bewildering array of readings the Nepalese manuscripts have for the word Gilgit and Kashgar have as *niṣpulāvā / niṣpalāpā*, and concludes that the Sanskrit form lying behind the readings, as indicated by Dharmarakṣa’s misunderstanding, is *niṣpulāka*. (But compare Pāli *palāpa / palāsa*, and see the passage quoted in the note to III.14, below.) He also notes that Kumārajīva seems to have understood **niṣpallava* (or **niṣpalāśa*), and further reports that some Nepalese manuscripts read *niṣphala* (we should remember in this context that it is the Nepalese reading of *śraddhā* for *śuddha* which Tibetan has rendered with *dad pa*). Where this all

Amongst the grain there are some that are not ripe, are not vigorous, do not bear fruit,¹ but look like grain, and these are called “weeds.” Similarly, Kāśyapa, the weed śramaṇa too, being weak and powerless, is consumed by Māra, overcome by Māra,² overthrown by all defilements, as if shaken by the wind. Kāśyapa, the term “weed śramaṇa” is a designation for evil precept breaking monks, and I style them “weed śramaṇas.”

III.14

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the malicious śramaṇa? ³ By way of example, Kāśyapa:

leaves us we cannot be quite sure. If the Tibetan corresponded perfectly with the consensus of the Gilgit and Kashgar texts (which do not completely agree with each other!), we might suggest that *shin te ma* renders **pulāka* or **palāva*. (Can **palāva* = **pallava*?) But it is far from impossible that the Sanskrit text from which the Tibetan translators worked had instead **niṣphala*. From the context here in the *Ratnarāśi*, however, let us note that *pulāka* is defined by MW as “shrivelled or blighted or empty or bad grain.” Nevertheless, the examples quoted in Böhtlingk and Roth 1855-75 s.v., in Kauṭilya, and so on seem to indicate an already dried and edible, even if not desirable, grain. (We might also want to notice here the vocable *niṣpāva*, found for example in *Amāraśa* 2,24 [Saṃkīrṇavarga]; it is said to mean not only winnowing [of grain], but also a kind of pulse.)

Chinese has here 蒲生沙門, cat-tail (?) śramaṇa. I think the reading 蒲 is preferable to 通, which seems to me impossible (see Morohashi XI.46 [38871]). Chang et al. 1983: 294, however, translated “underdeveloped,” with a note reading “literally, ‘new born.’” I do not understand that rendering, although it is true that Morohashi does list the meaning “slow” for the term 通 (definition 7). Chang et al. seem to have hedged in the following as well, perhaps to justify this understanding. The translation reads “They look like rice, but actually they are not yet rice.” But the Chinese is clear: “They look like rice, but they are not 非 rice.” 非 does not mean “not yet.” A precise identification of 蒲, however, is not easy. Morohashi IX.10179 (31611) seems to identify it with cat-tail, which as far as I know does not look like rice or rice seedlings. It is true, however, that cat-tail looks exactly like pearl millet (*pennisetum typhoides*).

Xuanying (quoted in the notes to the edition of the Chinese text) comments that 通 should be 稽, and he says: “It means that in a field some grain or beans, despite being unplanted, nevertheless grow on their own, and this is called 稽.”

¹ The translation is a conjecture. I do not know the meaning of *'ongs med*, but suppose that it might be something like “do not bring [fruit],” or “do not prosper / grow.” Ms. Miya Shimada suggests to me the meaning in Tibetan of “infertile,” sterile, barren,” based on the idea that, quite literally, “they have no future.” Chinese has no corresponding expression.

² A variant reading in the Tibetan translation adds here: “overcome by all defilements.”

³ Tibetan has *dge sbyong sun par byed pa*, which seems to be related to *√daṣ*. As we will see below, a Pāli parallel might suggest **śramaṇadūṣin*. The context, however, strongly suggests that we look

Among the perfect new green shoots of barley¹ grows one that damages the barley, but since its color is similar to that green [of the shoots] and its form and characteristics also are similar, the owners of the barley consider all of them to be barley. However, when sprigs² appear from the barley shoots, then they injure the barley, and [then the farmers] do not consider [the sprigs] to be barley.

Similarly, Kāśyapa, since the monks who are malicious śramaṇas indeed sit among the assembly of monks and resemble in figure, outward form and appearance³ those who uphold the precepts, are virtuous, and are worthy of offerings, then donors and benefactors consider them to be monks and consider that they are worthy of offerings. Hence, if a malignancy which is a deluded man who while not a śramaṇa falsely claims to be a śramaṇa, who while not a follower of the practice of purity falsely claims to be a follower of practice of purity, rotting inside, arises out of the community, then dying, having reached the time of death, he will go to hell, and gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas who possess the divine eye see him born in hell. When they have seen him [there in hell], they feel great compassion for him as they think: “This deluded person formerly with the figure and outward form of a śramaṇa performed evil deeds and so he was born in a great hell. Just as when there is injury to barley the barley’s good qualities⁴ are

for some sort of agricultural reference here. Chinese, in fact, uses the same term here and in the following, “barley śramaṇa.” See the next note.

Note that BHSD s.v. *kāraṇḍava* has pointed out that the term appears in Mhy. 5669 = *sre de / sre ta*, in a list of cereals. Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 187b) has the same correspondence (spelled *sre da*).

¹ Zhang et al. 1985 defines *ljang bu* as *gro nas kyi myu gu snon po* 禾苗, 禾本科農作物的青苗. Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 56b) *stambha* (read *stamba*) = clump of grass, shrub. My friend Prof. Tanaka Kōji 田中耕司, an agronomy specialist at the Tōnan Ajia Kenkyūjo of Kyoto University, kindly informs me that 稗草 is also cultivated as a crop, but initially it was a weed, or it may just refer to malformed weak plants. But the parallel quoted above makes clear what the image should be.

² **mañjarī*, as at Mhy. 5745, 6837. Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 63a) also has this, but in addition *gundā* = *gundrā*.

³ KP §122: *varṇarūpalingasamsthānaśramaṇa*.

⁴ Probably the term *yon tan* here, translated as good qualities, is *guṇa*. Given this, and the context,

lost, so for him too the fruit of the good qualities of the śramaṇa are lost.” This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the malicious śramaṇa.”

III.15

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the imitation śramaṇa?¹ By way of example, Kāśyapa: There is a certain kind of metal called “great brass.”² When it is made very clean and made very pure, it comes to resemble gold. However, it is not similar to gold in value, to gold in color, in polished appearance,³ or in weight when weighed on a pair of scales. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the monk who is an imitation śramaṇa too washes his body well and puts on good, handsome clothes, purifies all the external practices of a śramaṇa, and is mindful of his coming and going, his looking ahead and looking around, his retraction and extension [of limbs], his holding of the upper monastic robe, begging bowl and monastic robes,⁴ but still

it may be that there is something of a play here on the sense of *guṇa* as the śramaṇa’s good qualities on the one hand and the efficacy or viability of the grain on the other.

¹ See the notes to I.9. Note the passage in the **Daśabhūmivibhāṣā*: “The dissembler: There are some people who dwell in a wilderness (*āraṇyaka*), wear patched robes (*pāṃśukūlika* [robes from a dust heap]), always live on alms food (*paiṇḍapātika*), eat in one sitting (*ekāsānika*), sleep in a sitting posture (*naiṣāḍika*), and do not eat after noon (*khalupaścādbhaktika*) because they seek material profit and reverence (**lābhasatkāra*). Someone may undertake such *dhuta* ascetic purification practices, thinking: ‘Others undertake these practices and obtain reverence and respect. I will undertake these practices and also obtain these [advantages].’ And so for the sake of material profit and reverence he comports himself behaving in a grave and dignified manner. This is termed dissembling.” T. 1521 (XXVI) 29b10-14: 矯異者。有人貪求利養故。若作阿練若。著納衣。若常乞食。若一坐食。若常坐。若中後不飲漿。受如是等頭陀行。作是念。他作是行。得供養恭敬。我作是行或亦得之。爲利養故改易威儀。名爲矯異。 The passage has also been translated by Dantinne 1991: 46-47, whose understanding differs a bit from mine.

² *ra gan* = *raitya*, Mhy. 5987. Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 165b) gives in addition *rīrī*, more usually written *rīti*. Chinese: gold gilded (?) copper, 金塗銅. I do not know what sort of process is indicated by this term, but it is evidently some sort of gilding.

³ The translation is speculative, since the term *bdar 'phro* is not in my dictionaries. Probably this is equivalent to 若揩磨時乃知非金, “if you rub and polish it then you will know that it is not gold.” Tibetan *bdar ba* means to polish, rub, and *'phro ba* to issue from.

⁴ In other words, as the Chinese translation says, all his behaviors as a śramaṇa are carried out

he is overcome by lusts, overcome by anger, overcome by delusion, overcome by defilements, overcome by [love of] profit and honor, overcome by arrogance, haughtiness, pride and conceit, egotism, high opinion of himself, pride of thinking things inferior to himself, and misplaced false pride,¹ enslaved by defilements; devoted to service [of people], but not devoted to the Teaching; he zealously applies himself to adorning his body, but does not zealously apply himself to being adorned by the precepts;² he is devoted to food and clothing, but not devoted to the Noble Teaching; he is not fearful of censure in the other world; he devotes himself here to this world, but does not devote himself to the future state; he relies on nourishing the body, profit, honor and fame, but does not rely on venerating the Teaching; he is stained by various stains, defiled by sin; he applies himself to the business of the house; because he possesses a mind which is like that of a layman, he is both pleased by happy things and afflicted by sufferings, and he is overcome by affection and aversion. All of his śramaṇic natures and

correctly. In the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (120.11-16) the positive external and accompanying internal signs which characterize a good monk are discussed. The *Ratnarāsi* is criticizing here the mere copying of these external signs: "Mindful awareness is discussed in the *Prajñāpāramitā*: Going, he is aware 'I am going,' standing he is aware 'I am standing,' lying down he is aware 'I am lying,' sitting he is aware 'I am sitting,' and he is aware of the situation of his body just exactly as it is. ... Whether he steps forward or steps backwards, he acts with mindful awareness. He acts with mindful awareness in his looking ahead and looking around, in his retraction and extension of limbs, in his holding his upper robe, belt, bowl and robes, in his eating, drinking, chewing, in his shaking off sleepiness and fatigue, in his coming, in his going, in his standing, in his sitting, in his sleeping, in his waking, in his speaking, in his silence, and in his private meditation." *saṃprajanyaṃ tu Prajñāpāramitāyāṃ uktam / carāṇaṃ carāṇi prajānāti sthitaḥ sthito 'smṛti prajānāti śayānaḥ śayita itī prajānāti / niṣaṇo niṣaṇo 'smṛti prajānāti yathā yathā cāsyah kāyah sthito bhavati tathā tathaiḥ prajānāti // pe // so 'tikrāman vā pratikrāman vā saṃprajānaṃ carī bhavati / ālokite vilokite saṃmiñjite prasārite saṃghātīpaṭṭapātracivaradhāraṇe aśite pīte khādite nidrāklama-prativinodane āgate gate sthite niṣaṇe supte jāgarite bhāṣite tuṣṇībhāve pratisaṃlayane saṃprajānaṃ cārī bhavati. Compare to this passage the *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Ghoṣa 1902-13: 1429.1 and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 215.9-10. See BHSD s.v. ālokita-vilokita. Pāli commentaries have it as looking ahead and looking all around, with Tibetan. See also CPD s.v. For the next see BHSD s.v. saṃmiñjita and prasārita.*

¹ Mhy. 1946-52: māna, adhimāna, mānātimāna, asmimāna, abhimāna, ūnamāna, mithyāmāna.

² Chinese omits "but does not zealously apply himself to being adorned by the precepts."

deportments, and all of his thoughts and mental states, are inclined toward hell, the realm of beasts, the realm of the king of the dead.¹ He is not similar to a śramaṇa in value, in worth or in the measure of a śramaṇa. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the imitation śramaṇa.”

III.16

Now then, Kāśyapa, in what way is one a monk robbed of vital essence?² By way of example, Kāśyapa: If some man or woman or boy or girl has his vital strength robbed by a non-human, he is weakened, ugly and becomes disfigured. Those whose strength is thus robbed are not healed by medicines, incantations or magical spells,³ and finally their end will be none other than death. Similarly,

¹ From “he applies himself to the business of the house,” the Chinese reads: “he applies himself to the business of the house with the mind of a layman. And according to what he experiences, when it is unpleasant he suffers, when it is pleasant he is pleased. He does not want to practice the practices appropriate for a śramaṇa, except (external) conduct and deportment. He will certainly fall into hell, or rebirth as an animal or hungry ghost.”

² *gzi* = *ojas*. Chinese 血氣. CPD s.v. suggests also “nutritive essence.” Compare *ojohāra*, BHSD s.v., in which demons who sap the strength of individuals are mentioned. Schopen 1978: 262-64 has quoted a number of examples of phrases in which *yakṣas* and so on carry off the *ojas* of someone, for example SP 450.5 and *Ratnaketu* 140.10. Gonda 1952 offers his habitual encyclopedic treatment in tracing the term *ojas* from the Vedas through the epics and later. It is worth quoting his comments on *ojas* in the medical context (44-45): “As far as *ojas* is concerned, it is important to remember that according to the Indian experts the human body consists of seven essential constituents, to wit: *rasa* - ‘the primary juice or fluid,’ *rakta* - ‘blood,’ *māṁsa* - ‘flesh,’ *medas* - ‘fat,’ *asthi* - ‘bones,’ *majja* - ‘marrow,’ and *śukra* - ‘semen.’ The quintessence of these seven ‘elements’ is called *ojas*. It is regarded as the strongest, the most potent power among them It is the bearer of the vital function and constitutes the fundament on which the preservation of the body depends. Without *ojas* the elements of the body do not live As long as it is upheld, the human being continues to exist, when it perishes, man passes away. Anger, hunger, sorrow, weariness are injurious to it; then man becomes timid, weak, lean, pale and sad. In extreme cases the decline of this central vital power results in death.” Filliozat 1964: 166-68 has also discussed the medical concept of *ojas*.

The Chinese term 血氣 appears to be what we might call a “cultural translation.” Morohashi (1955-60: 10.129 = 33964.24) cites the term from as early as the Book of Rites 禮記 and the Confucian Annalects 論語, and perhaps it was its “canonical” status which induced the translators of the *Ratnarāsi* to select it as an equivalent for *ojas*.

³ Chinese adds: “sword and staff.” I do not know what sort of medical treatment might be so

Kāśyapa, any monk whose: precepts are without vital essence; concentration is without vital essence; wisdom is without vital essence; liberation is without vital essence; vision and knowledge of liberation are without vital essence; friendliness is without vital essence; compassion is without vital essence; joy is without vital essence; equanimity is without vital essence;¹ liberality, self-control and gentleness are without vital essence; śramaṇa virtues are without vital essence;² dwelling in the saintly attitudes is without vital essence; dhuta ascetic purification practices and austerities are without vital essence; purity of body, speech and mind is without vital essence³ — Kāśyapa, he is what is mean by “the monk robbed of vital essence.”

III.17

Kāśyapa, those robbed of vital essence in that fashion cannot cure⁴ themselves with the medicines prepared by the Tathāgata; that is:

- 1) The medicine of [the contemplation of] impurity [as a curative] for

carried out. Various colleagues have suggested that the first term, at least, refers to some sort of surgery. I owe to my friend Nobuyoshi Yamabe a reference to the Mahāśāṃghika Vinaya T. 1425 (XXII) 488b12-25, in which “sword therapy” 刀治 is discussed. The Buddha prohibits the use of surgery on “intimate areas” 愛處; the example refers to hemorrhoid surgery.

¹ Chinese omits “joy is without vital essence; equanimity is without vital essence.”

² Chinese has “gentleness” as “control of actions of body, speech and mind,” and omits “śramaṇa virtues are without vital essence.”

³ At least part of this listing is made up of well known sets of terms: *śīla, samādhi, prajñā, vimukti, vimuktijñānadarsana, maitrī, karuṇā, muditā, upekṣā, dāna, saṃyama, sauratyā, śramaṇaguṇa, ārya-vaiśya, dhūtaguṇa, samlekha, kāyavānmanas-parisuddhi*.

⁴ My translation here is a conjecture, since I think the term *tshugs pa* must mean cured, saved, but the dictionaries give only the meaning to injure, to harm. Zhang et al. 1985 s.v. *tshugs pa* has *gzugs po thang por nad kyi mi tshugs pa* = 身体健康疾病不能侵害, to be healthy and disease be unable to injure one. Luis Gómez, however, brought to my attention the entry in Jäschke’s dictionary (s.v. *’dzugs pa*) which refers to the expression *śman ma zug*, “the medicine has not yet taken hold, does not work.” Chinese has 如失氣沙門雖受如來法藥不以自度, “for instance, a śramaṇa who has lost his vital essence, although he received the Tathāgata’s dharma-medicine, does not [is not able to] save himself.”

- lust, and
- 2) of [the contemplation of] friendliness for [as a curative] for hatred, and
 - 3) of [the contemplation of] dependent origination for [as a curative] for delusion; and
 - 4) of correct mental contemplation [as a curative] for the defilements;¹ and
 - 5) of delighting in seclusion [as a curative] for garrulous association with others;² and
 - 6) of dwelling in the wilderness in order to remove all attachments;³ and

¹ See Sakurabe 1980: 308-9; For removal of defilements by *yonisāmanasikāra*, see KP §71. *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 60a6 = *Traité* (Lamotte 1944-1980): 34-5 (p. 35 n. 1); 227b = 1418, 238c = 1540, 478b. LV 32.21. The first three of the items listed here are a standard set, appearing for example in KP §94. The *Da Zhidu lun* compares them to herbal remedies. For example *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 60a21-b1 = *Traité* (Lamotte 1944-80): 34, after discussing such herbal cures says: “La considération de l’horrible (*aśubhabhāvanā*), dans la maladie de l’attachement (*rāgavyādhi*), est un bon remède (*kuśala pratipakṣadharmā*). ... La méditation amicale (*maitrīcittamanasikāra*), dans la maladie de la haine (*dveṣavyādhi*), est un bon remède. ... La considération des causes et conditions [Lamotte has *hetupratyaya-parīkṣā*, but probably *pratītyasamutpāda*^o is better], dans la maladie de la sottise (*mohavyādhi*), est un bon remède.” 不淨觀思惟於貪欲病中名為善對治法...思惟慈心於瞋恚病中名為善對治法...因緣觀法於愚癡病中名為善對治法. *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 227b8-11 = *Traité* (Lamotte 1944-80): 1417-18: “De la même manière [better: For example], on règle le médicament (*bhaiṣajya*) sur la maladie (*vyādhi*) pour qu’il soit efficace. Il y a des gens particulièrement amoureux (*rāgabahula*), particulièrement haineux (*dveṣabahula*), particulièrement sots (*mohabahula*) Aux amoureux, on prêche la contemplation des horreurs (*aśubhabhāvanā*); aux haineux, on prêche la bienveillance (*maitrīcitta*); aux sots, on prêche la profonde production des phénomènes en dépendance (*gambhīrapratītyasamutpāda*).” 譬如隨病服藥則有益。有婬欲重有瞋恚重有愚癡重...婬重者為說不淨觀瞋重者為說慈心癡重者為說深因緣. See also T. 1509 (XXV) 238c14-16 = *Traité* (Lamotte 1944-80): 1540. I owe these references to Sakurabe 1980, which also contains further references. To my friend Honjo Yoshifumi 本庄良文 I owe references to Sthiramati’s *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyaṭīkāttavārtha* (Ōtani 5895, Tōh 4421) Derge 98a5-7, and to the *Nyāyānusāra* of Saṃghabhadra 阿毘達磨順正理論 T. 1562 (XXIX) 346c26-347a1.

² Compare SP 309.10-11: *ete ’jita kulaputrā vivekārāmā vivekābhiratāḥ. naite kulaputā deva-manuṣyān upanīśrāya viharanti asaṃsargacaryābhiratāḥ*. “These sons of good family, Ajita, revel in solitude, delight in solitude. These sons of good family do not dwell near gods and men and are not delighted with the practice of garrulous association with others.”

³ Chinese has: “give up one’s possessions.”

- 7) of purifying body, speech and mind in order to restrain the three;
and
- 8) the medicine of purifying concentration in order to make the mind
capable of work.¹

— they cannot cure themselves with such medicines as these prepared by the Tathāgata. They will die and will certainly go to hell; there will be no other end for them.

III.18

Whichever supramundane medicine it might be — namely, knowledge of the aggregates, knowledge of the spheres, knowledge of the senses, knowledge of dependent co-origination, knowledge of emptiness, the signless and the wishless² — even by such supramundane medicines as these they will not be cured. And having died, they will certainly go to hell; there will be no other end for them.³

¹ Chinese combines items 7 and 8: “One should carefully protect the three qualities of the renunciant. Those three are namely: a) to uphold the precepts in purity; b) to restrain the mind; c) to enter into concentration and not to be distracted.”

Compare KP §153 *dhyānacittakramanīyakarmanīkṛtāḥ*. Pāli PTSD *kammaniya*, “workable,” fit for work, often with *citta*, “with active mind.” PTC II.31b, BHSD s.v. *karmaniya*.

² See KP §94 for a list of therapies similar to this. It is worthwhile noting that the translation 無作 for *apraṇihita* is archaic; 無願 is more standard. 無作 usually renders *avijñapti* in later translations. 無作 occurs for *apraṇihita* however in, for example, the *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 95c2, 96b29, 96c3,6, etc. etc. See further Mochizuki 1932-36: 1498c, 1512c, Oda 1917: 618c, 619a.

³ Here Chinese has instead of “And having died, they will certainly go to hell; there will be no other end for them” the following: “Such a śramaṇa has a foul smell and is impure because he breaks the precepts, because he has few virtues, because he is born in the lowest place (?), because he is haughtily arrogant, when his life ends he will be born nowhere else but will certainly fall into a great hell. A person such as this who has lost the vital essence will certainly die. Thus such a śramaṇa will upon his death certainly fall into hell. Kāśyapa. This is called the śramaṇa who has lost his vital essence.”

III.19

When this teaching had been preached, five-hundred yogācāra monks thought: “As we do not purify the precepts, if we were to enjoy the gift of faith it would not be right,” and they became dejected and went back home.¹ Then, a few other monks criticized them saying: “It is very bad that these yogācārins, monks who possess a magnanimous attitude,² are dejected by the teaching.”

III.20

The Blessed One spoke to those monks as follows: “Monks! You must not say “It is very bad that these monks who possess a magnanimous attitude are thus severely dejected by the teaching.” Why? When monks become displeased [with their behavior as monks], this [returning to the] home life is the proper course for those possessed of faith. These monks of great faith and conviction, possessed of remorse, having heard this teaching became despondent, thinking: “We did not purify the precepts and as such it is not right that we enjoy the gift of faith.” Kāśyapa, I predict:³ These monks dying from here will be born among the assembly of gods of Tuṣita, and they will enter into the numbers of the first

¹ Chinese omits “yogācāra” both times in this section, and the expression “... thought: ‘As we do not purify the precepts, if we were to enjoy the gift of faith it would not be right,’ and....” Further, Chinese has 捨戒還俗, “reject the precepts and return to the laity.” The present episode already occurred in *Ratnarāṣi* I.13-14. See the Introduction for a detailed discussion of this episode and the problems relating to leaving the monastic community.

² *māhātmya.

³ This is a *vyākaraṇa*, a prediction of future buddhahood or other high status. See the Introduction for a discussion of the issues here.

assembly of the auditors of the Tathāgata Maitreya.”¹

The Chapter on the Outcaste-like Śramaṇa; The Third.²

¹ Chinese has the section as follows: “The Buddha said to the monks: Do not say this! Why? Such ones are called those who are in accord with the Teaching. Such monks who do not want to receive gifts of faith from others and return to the home life are called those in accord with the Teaching. Because those monks have faith and conviction (*adhimukti*) they produce remorse. When this teaching was taught, they heard it and thought: “Since we cannot practice purely and thus obtain gifts of faith, we should produce remorse and return to the household life.” Kāśyapa. I now proclaim that these monks upon their deaths will be reborn in Tuṣita heaven, in the place where the bodhisattva Maitreya is. And when the Tathāgata Maitreya appears, those monks will be among his first assembly.”

² Tibetan adds here: Beginning of volume two [of the Tibetan translation].

The English Translation: Chapter Four

<On Supervision>

IV.1

Then the Reverend Mahākāśyapa spoke to the Blessed One: “Blessed One, what sort of monk shall superintend?”¹ The Blessed One said: “There are two [types of] monks, Kāśyapa, I allow to superintend. Which two? The monk who is purified, who is fearful of censure in the other world, who has confidence [in the idea that results will come about for him as] the maturation of [his own] deeds,² and who feels shame and feels remorse, and also the one whose depravities are destroyed and who has become an Arhat — Kāśyapa, I allow these two unimpaired monks to superintend.”³

IV.2

Why? Because, Kāśyapa, in this well-taught Dharma and Vinaya are renunciants

¹ The term referred to here is *vaiyāpṛtyakara*. See the discussion in the Introduction.

² We find the identical expression at KP §8: *karmavipākapratisaraṇa*. So too in the *Akṣayamatī-sūtra*, quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 316.16: “He has confidence in [the idea of] the maturation of deeds, thinking: ‘Whatever act I perform, I will experience the maturation of the fruits of that act.’” *sa karma-vipākapratisaraṇo bhavati yad yat karma kariṣyāmi tasya tasya karmaṇaḥ phalavipākam pratyanu-bhaviṣyāmīti*. The Tibetan of the passage is found in Braarvig 1993: I.139,20-22.

³ The Chinese has divided things entirely differently: A): 1) One who can purely uphold the precepts, 2) One who is fearful of the other world, for instance like a vajra. B: 1) One who is aware of and knows the results of karmic actions, 2) One who feels shame and modesty and repents. C: 1) An arhat, 2) One who can practice the eight liberations [*vimokṣa*]. Finally, probably what is “these two unimpaired monks” in Tibetan is rendered in Chinese as “themselves being free of (literally) abscess and pox.” I do not know what Sanskrit might stand behind the latter rendering. There seems to be two types of monk here, one still dutifully on the path, the other having already reached the goal. This is, moreover, the interpretation of the parallel passage in the *Sūryagr̥hasūtra*, discussed in detail in the Introduction.

from various backgrounds,¹ they possess various types of mental predispositions,² and they engage in various types of yogic practices for the sake of renunciation: some delight in the bed and seat of the pacified forest dweller, some are alms beggars, some dwell among the relations from their village, some have a purified way of living,³ some apply themselves to great learning,⁴ some are reciters of the Teaching,⁵ some uphold the monastic discipline,⁶ some uphold the Abhidharma,⁷ and some enter into villages, towns, markets, districts and metropolises and preach the Teaching. Because it is difficult to protectively watch over the thoughts and actions of other beings [I allow only those two types of pure monks to be superintendents].⁸ In this respect, Kāśyapa, the monk who superintends should please the minds⁹ of all the monks of the community.

IV.3

Now, Kāśyapa, whichever wilderness-dwelling monks keep their seat and bed in a

¹ The translation “backgrounds” is a slightly free rendering of *rigs* = **kula*. I do not know if we should limit it strictly to “family,” which would be more literal.

² **nānādhimukti*. BHSD s.v. *adhimukti*.

³ **parisuddhājīva*.

⁴ **bāhuśrūtya*.

⁵ **dharmakathika*, as below.

⁶ **vinayadhara*.

⁷ **māṭṛkādhara*, Mhy 5143.

⁸ Chinese has this sentence at the beginning of the section, and logically speaking it makes little difference. The Chinese of this sentence, 護他人意此事難故, is not easy to understand. Nagai 1932: 235, note 15 suggests that it means “respect the intentions of others” (他之人の心を尊重する). Tibetan suggests something like **anyasattvānām cittacaritadūrakṣa*-. The Tibetan *sems kyi spyod pa* = **cittacarita* might point to an understanding as a genitive *taṭpuruṣa*, but what is evidently the same term appears in the VKN, for example, as a *dvandva* (Öshika 35.15, 41.8, 49.9: *sems dang spyod pa*). I have translated it as a *dvandva*, although with some reservations. I do not fully understand the term, and if it is actually a *taṭpuruṣa* I am truly baffled.

⁹ See CPD s.v. *abhirādheti*, “to satisfy, conciliate.” This is also the standard Sanskrit usage (Böhtlingk and Roth 1855-75: VI.323), “zufriedenstellen, befriedigen.”

border region¹ should not be charged [with tasks] by the superintending monk. The superintendent must look after those forest dwelling monks, and he shall not make requests of them at inappropriate times, he shall not send them on errands at inappropriate times.² If it falls, Kāśyapa, to the turn of the wilderness-dwelling monk to carry out the student's task relating to the community's work, the superintending monk should do that task himself. Or, appointing another monk he should order him to do that task, but should not pressurize³ the wilderness-dwelling monk.⁴

IV.4

Now, Kāśyapa, that superintending monk should allot sumptuous food to those monks who practice alms begging.⁵ Now, Kāśyapa, the superintending monk

¹ BHSD s.v. *prānta* (with numerous references), Mhy 2988 *prāntaśayyāsana*. The term seems to denote dwelling in the wilderness, as at Mv. ii.212,9 *prāntaśayyāsana vihārī* (although I do not think we need to understand *-vihārī* with Jones [1952: 2.202] as "content"). In Mv. iii.422,9 *prāntaśayyāsana* replaces *vivittasayana* of Dhṛp. 271 (Uv. 32.31 *vivikṭasayana*, GDhp 65 *vevittasayana*, and see Brough's note). RP 14.14-15 reads *prāntaśayyāsana bhīratīḥ sā ca lābhasatkārānapekṣatayā*, that is, one of the four noble paths which a bodhisattva must follow is to "delight in having his bed and seat in a border region, through indifference to material profit and reverence." This passage is in the Han translation of *Rāṣṭra-pālapariṣcchā* T. 170 (III) 412c4-5. A verse at RP 31.13-14 points to the important role of the wilderness for the Mahāyāna under siege: "Those sons of mine reviled from all sides in the last age, calling to mind my words will then dwell in a border forest region." *nirbhartsatāpi ca samantāt te hi mamaurasās carimakāle / vacanaṁ ca te mama hi smṛtvā prāntavane tadābhinivasanti //*. Chinese of the *Ratnarāśi* has here rather "delight in isolated places."

² This sentence is omitted in Sanskrit and Chinese.

³ I translate the Sanskrit *utpīḍayitavya*, "pressurize, annoy," here, rather than Tibetan *gnod pa*, which renders "harm," another meaning of *utpīḍ*. I do not understand, however, how this might correspond with the Chinese 不應役使阿蘭若比丘. "He should not employ the wilderness-dwelling monk as a servant." Perhaps the latter is interpretive.

⁴ Chinese adds here: "If there is a time he [the forest-dwelling monk] is not practicing the path, then he [the supervisory monk] may assign him [the forest-dwelling monk] a small amount of work."

⁵ According to the *pāṭayantikā* / *pāccittiya* and *prāṭideśanika* / *pāṭidesanīya* of the various Vinayas, monks are prohibited from begging for sumptuous (*praṇīta*) food: *Sarvāstivāda Prātimokṣa* (Finot and Huber 1913), *pāṭayantikā* 40 (510.13-511.3; see now von Simson 1986: 223 [and 277], which I print without apparatus): *yāni punas tāni kuleṣu praṇītabhojanāny anujñātāni tadyathā kṣīraṁ dadhi navanītaṁ*

should give to those who are yogācārin monks appropriate paraphernalia, medicine to cure the sick, and personal belongings. In whatever place that yogācārin monk is dwelling the superintending monk should not cry aloud and yell nor permit [others] to do so.¹ The superintending monk should protect that yogācārin monk and also provide him with a bed. He should give him sumptuous food, savories and hard food and soft food² suitable for [one in] the stage of a yogācārin.³ It occurs to that [superintending] monk: “This [yogācāra] monk lives in order to promote the Tathāgata’s teaching. I should generously provide him with all the appropriate personal belongings,” and he should resolve to very carefully protect him from harm.⁴

IV.5

Now, Kāśyapa, the superintending monk should encourage whichever monks apply themselves zealously to great learning, saying: “You must accept the transmitted teachings, you must read them, you must recite them, and I must be

sarpis tailaṃ matsyo māṃsavallūrā yaḥ punar bhikṣur evaṃrūpāṇi kuleṣu praṇītabhojanāny ātmārtham aglāno vijñāpayet pātayantikā: If a monk were to take such pleasing foods as milk, yoghurt, ghee, sesame oil, fish, meat or dried meat, that monk would incur a *pātayantikā* offence. The *prāṭideśanīya* is on 525-27. Almost exactly the same rule is found in the following: Mūlasarvāstivāda: Banerjee 1977: 36.7-10, #40; Mahāsāṃghika: Tatia 1975: 22.19-22, #39 = Pachow and Mishra 1956: 25.17-20, Roth 1970: §252, and see Hirakawa 1982: 375ff.; Pāli (Theravāda): *pācittiya* 39 Vin iv.87-89 = Pātimokkha ed. Vedekar 1939: 14.8-10, *pāṭidesaniya* Vin iv.346-48 = Pātimokkha ed. Vedekar 20-21; *Upālipariṇcchāsūtra* (Stache-Rosen 1981: 74) #42..

¹ Sanskrit omits “nor permit [others] to do so,” but Chinese has it.

² The classification is a common one. For Pāli see PTC s.v. *khādati* (II.80a), and for Sanskrit see BHSD s.v. *khādaniya*.

³ We encounter here a crucial term, *yogācārabhūmi*. I have discussed this in detail in the Introduction. The Chinese translation renders “... yell nor permit other to do so, because he wants to protect that yogācāra monk. The supervisory monk should honor the yogācāra monk thinking of him as the Blessed One.”

⁴ Chinese omits “and he should resolve very carefully to protect him from harm.”

your attendant. The more greatly learned you become, the more you must become an ornament of the community of monks. You must sit down and ornament [the community] with your speech. You must make your own wisdom supreme.” Now, Kāśyapa, the superintending monk shall not send them on errands at inopportune times, and he shall not assign them tasks. The superintending monk shall protect those monks of great learning.

IV.6

Now, Kāśyapa, the superintending monk shall not assign tasks to those who are reciters of the Teaching.¹ He shall cause them to enter villages, towns, markets, districts and royal metropolises and preach the Teaching. He shall inspire the audience.² He shall purify an assembly area.³ He shall arrange an assembly

¹ The meaning of the Tibetan text is quite clear. The Sanskrit text, however, is not as easy to understand. The second clause reads: *teṣāṃ pratiḥāradharmatā kartavyā*, with *teṣāṃ* referring to *ye dharmakathikā*. Wogihara 1904: 99-100 translated the Chinese of the *Ratnarāśi* corresponding to *pratiḥāradharmatā kartavyā*, 應事事供給, as “with everything must he supply,” and stated: “We are induced to read *pratikāra-dh*° or ‘h’ in *pratiḥāra* may be an insertion to avoid hiatus in original prakritic *pratiāra* [sic *pra* cluster with prakritic vowels!].” He refers to the form *jalāhari* (which he writes, for reasons beyond me, with an accent, *jalāhari*) in the *Lalitavistara*, and credits the suggestion to Ernst Leumann. I think, however, that the appeal to a hypothetical underlying Prakrit characterized by loss of intervocalic stops is, at best, a stretch. Such cases do occur, in Aśokan Prakrit and Gāndhārī, for example, but are far from common. The rendering offered in the English translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall and Rouse 1922: 56), “he must do duty as doorkeeper,” is perhaps correct, since the term *pratiḥāra* can have that meaning. Perhaps the sense of the Sanskrit is something like “he should do the duty of protecting them as a doorkeeper.” (Incidentally, the rendering of the Tibetan offered by Bendall and Rouse 1922: 56 in note 2, “must make them indefatigable,” is wrong.)

² The Sanskrit for this passage is quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and the term here is *udyojayitavya*. See CPD *uyyojeti* (2): to urge, instigate. BHSD s.v. *udyojayati* discusses the present passage, and concludes with the suggestion that the Sanskrit meaning of “arouse” or “inspire” is fitting. The Tibetan of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has *brtson par ’gyur*, to make zealous. Chinese: “The superintending monk should ... incite and encourage all the people and make them join and listen to the teaching [preached by the monk who is a reciter of the teaching].” I consider, therefore, the meaning of *ud’yuḥ* to be certain. However, I doubt that this can be the meaning of the reading of the Tibetan translation of the *Ratnarāśi*, *bsko bar bya’o*. The Tibetan as is would seem to mean “assign the audience [to him].” This meaning or slant could be inferred from the Chinese, but we might also consider two other possibilities: First, the Tibetan could be

area for the elegant preaching of the Teaching. The superintending monk shall expel those monks who do injury to a monk who is a preacher of the Teaching. The superintending monk shall always greet the monk who is a preacher of the Teaching, and shall congratulate him generously.¹

IV.7

Now, Kāśyapa, that superintending monk shall go before those monks who uphold the monastic discipline and those who uphold the Abhidharma and shall ask them: "How may I be faultless and uncorrupted? How may I superintend in a manner free from offence?" Then those monks who uphold the monastic discipline and those who uphold the Abhidharma, understanding that superintending monk's intention, shall inform him what he must do, what will happen, and what the means are to carry it out.²

an error for (b) *skul ba*, "to incite." Second, and what is perhaps more likely, the Tibetan translation is based on a different (in this case wrong) meaning of the simplex (non-causative) of *ud'lyuj*, namely "to prepare." (I owe the seeds of the latter suggestion to Luis Gómez.)

³ The expression is missing in Chinese, but found in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and its Chinese translation.

¹ Compare a passage in the *Sāgaramatisūtra*: "Again, Gentle son, serving, adoring, attending upon, rising for, making obeisance to, being respectful toward, reverencing, obeying, protecting, receiving (as a guest), providing with robes, begging bowl, sleeping mat, medicaments and other equipment, applauding, protecting as a master, preserving the virtue of, exposing the merits of, concealing the demerits of those preachers of the Teaching who expound such sūtras as these and who regard correct practice as quintessential is [called] protectively embracing the True Teaching." The passage is quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 41.15-42-1 (the Chinese of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is T. 1636 [XXXII] 83c25-84a1): *punar aparaṃ kulaputra ye te dharmbhāṇakā eṣāṃ evaṃrūpāṇāṃ sūtrāntānāṃ deśayitāraḥ pratipattisārāś ca teṣāṃ api dharmabhāṇakānāṃ yat sevanam bhajanam paryupāsanaṃ utthānam upasthānam gauravaṃ citrikāraḥ śuśruṣā āraḥ parigrahaś cīvarapiṇḍapātraśayanāsanāglānapratyayabhaiṣajyapariṣkāradānam sādhuḥkārādānam svāmyāraḥ kuśalapakṣaraḥ varṇabhāṣaṇam avarṇapratichhādanatā ayam api saddharmaparigrahaḥ.*

² Chinese has "namely: this you should do, this you should not do," for "what will happen, and what the means are to carry it out."

IV.8

The superintending monk shall take good care of the monks who uphold the monastic discipline and those who uphold the Abhidharma, and he shall generate faith, respect and high regard [toward them].¹ From time to time the superintending monk shall distribute to the community of monks what is the property of the community, but he shall not hoard the community's property and conceal it. The property is to be given as it was received;² it is to be given without being urged, it is to be given without objection.³ He should not proceed with caprice,⁴ hatred, delusion or fear.

IV.9

He shall devote himself to the community of monks, and he shall not devote himself to the group of householders.⁵ He shall devote himself to the necessities of the community, and he shall not devote himself to his own necessities. He shall not produce any idea that he shall rule over even a single place, but rather, no matter how trifling the matter, he shall act according to the counsel of the

¹ Perhaps the last two terms refer to the common pair *sagaurava* and *sapratīṣa*, on which see BHSD s.v. *sapratīṣa*. At KP §10 *sapratīṣa* is rendered with the spelling which in our edition is found as a variant, *rje sa*.

² I have not fully understood *ji ltar rnyed pa bzhin du sbyin par bya*. Does this mean to emphasize that the monk in charge of distribution should not alter or profit from the donations which pass through his hands, or is that reading too much into the expression?

³ Or, "kindly"? BHSD *avyābādha*, Mhy 1508. Luis Gómez suggests possibly "without coercion / pressure." Chinese has this sentence as: "He should divide up and give out the property. It should be given at an appropriate time, not with a bad mind, not in contradiction to the dharma."

⁴ If the Tibetan translation is consistent, the term is probably **chandas*; anyway, not *rāga* as the usual cliché and the Chinese translation here have it.

⁵ In KP §113, the renunciant is warned against frequenting those associated with the group of householders, and cautioned against hostility toward those belonging to the group of saints. However, the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Dutt 1934: 215.20) lists in a group of ten things to be renounced in the fifth bhūmi "familiarity with householders and renunciants."

community, not according to his own inclination.

IV.10

Whatsoever are the belongings of the local community, the universal community or the stūpa, he should assign them accordingly, and he shall not mix those of the local community with those of the universal community. Neither shall he mix the possessions of the universal community with that of the local community. He shall not mix the possessions of the local community and universal community with that of the stūpa. Neither shall he mix the possessions of the stūpa with that of the local community and universal community.¹ If the universal community is destitute and the local community has plenty, the superintending monk shall summon the community of monks and make them agree unanimously;² then he shall exchange from the local community's possessions to the universal community.

IV.11

If a stūpa of the Tathāgata is gone to ruin and the possessions of the local community or the universal community are abundant, the superintending monk shall gather all of the community of monks and make them agree unanimously,

¹ See the Introduction for a discussion of the rules concerning distribution of monastic goods in the various Vinayas.

² The Tibetan reads as I have translated, and the Sanskrit has here "make the community to be of one mind," but the Chinese specifies that a vote is to be taken, using the technical term **śalākā*, in Chinese *chou* 籌 (here actually *xingchou* 行籌, a term with identical meaning). For a very detailed discussion of the meaning and uses of *chou*, see *Hōbōgirin* 431a-456a, "Chū," by Hubert Durt.

saying: "The stūpa of the Tathāgata is gone to ruin, but the possessions of the local community and the universal community are abundant. If, Reverends, you have no objection,¹ if you are favorably inclined, if you allow, if you approve, I will take a small amount of supplies from these possessions of the local community and the universal community and I will repair the Tathāgata's stūpa." If the community allows it, that superintending monk shall do so. In case the community does not allow it, that superintending monk shall request the donors and benefactors and obtaining [their contribution] he shall repair the Tathāgata's stūpa.²

IV.12

No matter, Kāśyapa, how vast the possessions of the stūpa, the superintending monk shall not give them to the local community or the universal community. Why? If even so little as a single thread given to the stūpa by those faithful and full of devotion is a shrine for the world together with its gods, what need is there to mention jewels and highly valued objects?³ Whatever clothing is given to a stūpa had best be vanished by wind, sun, and rain; clothes given to a stūpa shall not be exchanged for gold or valuables. Why? Because what belongs to the

¹ The sense of *gnod pa med cing* seems to be **avyābadhya* or the like (BHSD s.v.). Desgodins 1899: 571b defines *gnod med pa* as "inoffensif."

² The Sanskrit has rather: "inspiring the donor and benefactors he should repair [the stūpa]." Chinese: "The supervisory monk should inspire the lay people and seek material support for repairing the stūpa of the Buddha." It might be better to understand *gsol ba* not as "request" but as "instigate" or "inspire."

³ BHSD s.v. *ratnasammatam* refers to Pāli Vin iv.161,26, 162,19, 163,13 for the expression *ratanaṃ vā ratanasammatam vā*, with the definition at 163,21-22: *yaṃ manussānaṃ upabhogaparibhogam etaṃ ratanasammatam nāma*: "what is of profit and use to men is *ratanasammatam*."

stūpa¹ is totally without price, and because the stūpa² is itself without any want.

IV.13

The superintending monk, Kāśyapa, shall thus purify things,³ and he shall not mix up the belongings of the Three Jewels. He shall be content with his own possessions. He shall not have the idea that those properties controlled by the Three Jewels are his own.

IV.14

Any superintending monk, Kāśyapa, who possesses a mind of anger, if he gets angry toward or rules over and orders about precept keepers, virtuous ones and those worthy of veneration, will, on account of those bad acts, go to hell.⁴ When he is reborn in a human world he will become a slave or servant of another, and he will be beaten and kicked by violent fist blows, slaps and weapons.⁵

¹ Chinese of both the *Ratnarāśi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* specify “Tathāgata’s stūpa.”

² Chinese of both the *Ratnarāśi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have “buddha” instead of “stūpa.”

³ Chinese is not very clear, but it might mean “a superintending monk, good and pure in this way” This is more or less how Chang et al. 1983: 298 have taken it (“a good, pure administrative monk”); although Nagai 1932: 238 seems to take it a bit differently, just how he understands the expression is not clear to me (善淨を有[も]てば、營事の人は...).

⁴ Chinese of both the *Ratnarāśi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have “great hell.”

⁵ The term “violent” is based on Sanskrit *pracaṇḍa*. Tibetan *snnyems pa* seems rather to mean “arrogant.” The expression is a rather loose stock phrase, for which see BHSD s.v. *khāṭa*. See for example the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* (Lévi 1932: 37.5-6), *khāṭacapetapradānam*. The term *lag cha* may correspond to *praharāṇa* (Mhy. 6105); is this related to *prahārāṇām*? The verb written *phrad pa* is strange. This means “the meet, encounter,” but we require actually *phra ba*, “to kick, lash out at.” Should we emend the Tibetan text?

IV.15

Moreover, Kāśyapa, if the superintending monk goes beyond the duties [necessary to] the community and commands the monks according to his own inclination, ordering them, punishing them, frightening them, threatening them, giving them untimely commissions or untimely orders, on account of those bad acts he will be born in the individual hell¹ named “many nails.” And being born there his body will be pierced by one hundred thousand iron nails, and they will catch fire and blazing up [the fire] will spread burning everywhere.

IV.16

From the verbal karma which will accrue from his hurtful speech of threatening precept keepers, virtuous ones or those worthy of respect, he will be born there [in that individual hell], and his tongue will be one hundred leagues in size, and one hundred thousand iron nails will be buried² in that tongue of his, and they too will catch fire, blaze up, and thoroughly blazing everywhere [the fire] will spread everywhere, burning, and become a [true] conflagration.³ Why? Because he

¹ Chinese of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has here “great hell,” while the *Ratnarāśi* has “minor hell.” That the reading in the Chinese *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is not a misprint is confirmed by the *Jisha* edition (#1521 [vol. 37] 49b2).

² Sanskrit has here *nikhāta*, that is, the nails are “dug into” the tongue. It appears that the Chinese translation of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has rendered this with 難忍. I wonder whether it is possible that the translators imagined some form of **niṣ-ksānti* < **nikkhānti* < **nikhānti*? The 難堪, “difficult to bear,” which appears immediately before 難忍. I cannot explain in a similar way. It appears to have no immediate correspondent in Sanskrit. Just from the point of view of the Chinese text, however, the whole expression, “It is difficult to bear and difficult to stand,” does make sense.

³ One may compare here the term 拔舌地獄, “pierced tongue hell.” Both Nakamura 1981: 1112bc and Oda 1917: 1451b refer only to the *Ōjōyōshu* 往生要集, but especially the entry of Nakamura is a bit misleading, since the *Ōjōyōshu* is in fact quoting the *Yogācārabhūmi* T. 1579 (XXX) 296b22ff. here. This entire section of the *Yogācārabhūmi* deals with the sufferings of various hells, and the exact torture described in the *Ratnarāśi* is mentioned. In addition, the term 拔舌地獄 is also found in the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* T. 376 (XII) 872b29, where it refers to the fate of one who misrepresents a teaching

threatened [the monks] and so produced destructive verbal karma with his speech.¹

IV.17

If any superintending monk, Kāśyapa, collecting the possessions of the community and hoarding what he has collected, does not give it out from time to time, [or] scorning and tormenting he gives it, and some he gives, some he does not give, to some he gives, to some he does not give, then on account of those bad acts he will be born in a hungry ghost realm called “Sunk up to his knees in excrement and mud.”² After he is born there, other hungry ghosts will seize his food and show it to him. And then, when they show it to him, he stares at that food with both eyes unblinking, and pained by hunger and thirst he will experience feelings of suffering. But he will not obtain that food even in one hundred thousand years. Even if at some point, at some time, he were to obtain that food, it would become vomit and pus and blood. Why? Because he did not gratify precept keepers, virtuous ones and those worthy of respect, and he was not content with what he himself possessed.³

of the Buddha concerning the propriety of slave ownership.

Compare the stock expression (for example *Divyāvadāna* 337.9-10) *ādīpta pradīpta samprajvalita ekajvālibhūta*.

¹ The question “why?” and its answer are omitted in the Chinese translation.

² Chinese has “and always eat balls of excrement” instead of “called ‘Sunk up to his knees in excrement and mud.’”

³ Chinese has: “Because he used for himself the goods of monks who uphold the precepts and those who are worthy of respect, and only gave them out with reluctance.”

IV.18

If any superintending monk, Kāśyapa, were to harbor a desire for what belongs to the local community, or the universal community, or the stūpa, the [karmic] maturation of that could not be expressed in words, even if I were to reckon for aeons.¹

IV.19

If any superintending monk, Kāśyapa, having heard of such miserable² destinies as these were to produce anger or abuse or hatred or wrath, I declare that he is incurable.³ Therefore, Kāśyapa, hearing such True Teachings as these,⁴ the superintending monk should purify his body, speech and mind. He should protectively look after himself and others.

IV.20

The superintending monk, Kāśyapa, even if he has to eat his own flesh, should not enjoy the bowls, robes, alms food, medicines or equipments controlled by the

¹ Chinese has the section as: "If a superintending monk were to indiscriminately mix and use the goods of the local community, universal community and buddha, he would receive great suffering as a result, for an aeon or even more than an aeon. Why? Because he infringes upon the possessions of the Three Jewels."

² **ādīnava*?

³ Compare the expression in KP §65 *tam aham acikitsyam iti vadāmi*: "Him I declare to be incurable." Note, however, that this occurs in the context of a monk who, using emptiness to dispose of views about the self, then becomes attached to that emptiness itself. In Pāli in the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* and other texts (AN iii.402,22 = Vin. ii.202,8 [*Cullavagga* VII.4.7] = MN i.393,3-4, and etc.), Devadatta is called *atekicchā*, the Pāli form of *acikitsya*. See CPD s.v. *atekicchā*.

⁴ Chinese has: "hearing about such *adharma* crimes as this" Is it possible some confusion was caused by the term **sad-dharma* being misunderstood as containing **a-dharma*?

Three Jewels.

IV.21

Then the Venerable Mahākāśyapa spoke thus to the Blessed One: “The Blessed One preaches the teaching for laxness to those who are lax, and the teachings for shame to those who are shameful.”

The Chapter on Supervision; The Fourth.

The English Translation: Chapter Five

<The Wilderness Dweller>

V.1

“Blessed One! Some wilderness-dwelling monks claim ‘I am a wilderness-dweller.’ Blessed One, in what ways is one a wilderness-dwelling monk? In what ways is one an alms-gathering monk? In what ways is one a refuse-rag wearing monk?”¹ And when this had been asked, the Blessed One spoke to the Venerable Mahākāśyapa as follows:

V.2

“The wilderness-dwelling monk, Kāśyapa, should make his bed and seat in a wilderness, an abode in the forest, and a border area.² He should dwell in wilderness border regions such as those without thieves, herdsmen or shepherds,³ without snakes, without wild beasts and flocks of birds, with few flies and stinging insects, with little noise, with few sounds of commotion.

¹ Chinese adds here: “In what ways is one called a monk who dwells at the base of a tree? In what ways is one called a monk who inhabits charnel grounds? In what ways is one called a monk who lives in the open air?” The list in Chinese, then, includes: *āranyaka*, *paiṇḍapātika*, *pāṇsukūlika*, *vrkṣamūlika*, *śmāśānika*, and *ābhyavakāśika*, that is, six of the twelve types of practitioners of the *dhutagaṇa* ascetic purification practices.

² Mhy 2988 *prāntaśayyāsana*, 2991 *aranya*, 2993 *vana*.

³ I am not sure, but perhaps **gopāla(ka)* and **paśupāla(ka)*. Chinese: 牧牛羊者.

V.3

If that [monk] is a dweller in that wilderness abode,¹ he should bring about eight deliberations. What are the eight?

- 1) He should not be concerned about his body.
- 2) He should not be concerned about his life.
- 3) He should not be concerned about wealth or honors.²
- 4) He should not be concerned about all garrulous associations with others.³
- 5) He should undertake to die in a wilderness⁴ like an animal.
- 6) He should dwell in the wilderness making use of the advantages offered by the wilderness.⁵
- 7) He should live with his livelihood in accord with the Teaching; he should not live wrongly.
- 8) He should live in accord with a livelihood free from worldly material possessions⁶ and defilements.

He should dwell in a wilderness abode bringing about those eight deliberations.⁷

¹ Chinese: "If that monk wants to dwell in a wilderness area."
² For the first three items Chinese has "I should abandon my body ... life ... wealth and honors."
³ The terms in this and the previous item are **lābhāsatkāra* and **saṃsarga*.
⁴ Tibetan actually rather has the term in the plural, "wildernesses"!
⁵ I have some doubt about this rendering, but I provisionally understand *dgon pa'i yon tan* as **aranyagūṇa*, a term which however I cannot quote. Chinese: "undertaking the wilderness practices."
⁶ Chinese omits "worldly material possessions."
⁷ Compare this passage with one from the "Twelve Dhūtaguṇa sūtra," 十二頭陀經 quoted in the Introduction.

V.4

If he is a dweller in that wilderness abode, he should produce eight types of friendliness toward all beings. What are the eight?

- 1) The friendliness of benefiting [beings], and
- 2) The friendliness of pleasing [beings], and
- 3) The friendliness without injury¹ [to beings], and
- 4) Correct friendliness, and
- 5) Undifferentiated friendliness, and
- 6) The friendliness of mental calming,² and
- 7) The friendliness of profound concentration on the teaching, and
- 8) The friendliness of completely purified intention.³

He should produce those eight [types of] love toward all beings.⁴

¹ Chinese has “without hatred (**dveṣa*).”

² **samatha*. Chinese has 順慈, which I cannot understand. Perhaps Chang et al. 1983: 300 is right in rendering “to be compliant with sentient beings.” Generally speaking 順 renders *anukūla* or terms with *anu*^o. (In I.7 順 = *dang* ‘*thun pa*’ = *anukūla* [in *samsārānukūla*].) What the connection between this and **samatha* might be I cannot guess.

³ For a possible explanation of the connection between Tibetan *bsam pa yongs su dag pa* = **āśaya(vi)śuddha* and Chinese 淨如虛空 = **ākāśaviśuddhita*, see the Introduction.

⁴ A passage in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 212.12-14, rationalizes three degrees of friendliness. The classification in the *Ratnarāṣi* does not present the same sort of schematization, but the two are interesting as offering contrasting presentations of similar material from texts which both belong, at least in a broad view, to more or less the same stratum of the tradition. The sūtra reads: “Bodhisattvas who have just raised the first aspiration for awakening have living beings as the object of their friendliness. Bodhisattvas who have perfected their practice have the teaching [or: (all) things] as the object [of their friendliness]. And bodhisattvas who have attained the tolerance of the non-arisal of [all] things have friendliness without any object.” *satvārambaṇā maitrī prathamacittotpādikānām bodhisatvānām / dharmārambaṇā caryāpratipannānām bodhisatvānām / anārambaṇā maitrī anutpattikadharma-kṣāntipratilabdhanām bodhisatvānām //*. (The Tibetan text is edited in Braarvig 1993: I.86,30-34, and translated with reference to the commentary II.352. Braarvig’s English rendering differs slightly from mine.)

V.5

If he is a dweller in that wilderness abode, he should think thus: “I have come here on a long path, alone, unaccompanied, without any friend at all to admonish me about things I have done well or done wrong. Whatever gods, nāgas, yakṣas, gandharvas or buddhas, blessed ones, there are who know my mental disposition will be my witnesses if, when I am dwelling in the wilderness abode, I should come under the influence of bad thoughts.”¹

V.6

“I have come on a long path and am alone, unaccompanied, with nothing on which to rely, without possessions, without chattels. If I were to focus with a focus on physical desire, if I were to focus with a focus on malicious thoughts, if I were to focus with a focus on harming [others],² or if I were to focus with a focus on other bad things, I would be no different from those beings who delight in garrulous association with the company of others. I would deceive the gods, nāgas, yakṣas, and gandharvas, and I would not gladden the buddhas, blessed ones, either. I must think: “May it be such that the gods will not censure me and

¹ Sanskrit reads as follows: “While dwelling in that wilderness abode he should think thus: Although I came to the wilderness alone, unaccompanied, with no friend who might admonish me about things I have done well or done wrong, still there are these gods, nāgas, yakṣas and buddhas, blessed ones, who know my mental disposition. They are my witnesses: [They know whether] while I am dwelling here in this wilderness retreat I will come under the influence of bad thoughts.” As an equivalent for the last sentence, the Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāṣi* has: “Now I am here practicing the practices of a wilderness dweller. If I do not have a good mental attitude, I will not be able to be free / attain lordship (?)” It seems that the Chinese translations of both the *Ratnarāṣi* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have understood *vaśa* with √gam as “become free” 自在. For this rendering see Wogihara 1964-74 s.v. *vaśa* (page 1181a). I cannot understand the Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* here very well at all.

² The expression up to this point is a stock phrase, for which see for instance LV 71.8-9: *na ca kāmavitarkam vā vyāpāḍavitarkam vā vihiṃsāvitarkam vā vitarkayati sma*. Aṣṭa 981 quoted *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 39.15f: *na kāmavitarkam utpadyamāsa na vyāpāḍavitarkam na vihiṃsāvitarkam utpadyamāsa*. See also I.4, above.

buddhas, blessed ones, also will be pleased with me.”

V.7

If he is a dweller in that wilderness abode,

- 1) He should be bound by the vows of the monastic disciplinary rule,¹ and
- 2) He should uphold completely all of the constituent elements of morality,² and he should:
- 3) Be pure in body, speech and mind, and
- 4) Be without deceit, and
- 5) Be without boasting,³ and
- 6) Be of pure livelihood,⁴ and
- 7) Direct himself to acquiring the mind of concentration, and
- 8) Depend on the Teaching as he has learnt it, and
- 9) Be devoted to correct mental reflection,⁵ and
- 10) Seek what is free of despair and desire, [namely] cessation and nirvāṇa, and
- 11) Be fearful of saṁsāra, and

¹ **prātimokṣasaṁvara*.

² **śīlaskandha*. Chinese has 戒衆; see Mochizuki 1932-36: 1288b, Wogihara 1964-74: 1337a.

³ Chinese omits this item; the subsequent numbering is thus offset by one until Chinese inserts an item between 14 and 15, after which the numbering comes back into line between Tibetan and Chinese.

⁴ The two previous items refer to the absence of *kuhanā* and *lapanā*, the first two of the five incorrect manners of livelihood (*mithyājīva*). That makes it likely that we should understand this item, perhaps *(*pari*)*śuddhājīva*, to comprise the complete negation of all five. See Wogihara 1936: (Lexical remarks) 21-26, and Lamotte 1944-80: 1182-83, note 2.

⁵ **yonīśamanasikāra*.

- 12) Know the aggregates to be an executioner and enemy, and
- 13) Quickly recognize the four elements¹ to be a poisonous snake,
and
- 14) Take pleasure in the six senses as in an empty village,² and
- 15) Be wise in his understanding of dependent co-origination, and
- 16) Completely reject views of permanence and annihilation, and
- 17) Consider there to be no beings, no life, no individual, no person,
and
- 18) Be convinced of emptiness,³ and
- 19) Have as his domain the signless, and
- 20) Magnify his attitude of wishlessness,⁴ and
- 21) Always possess a mind fearful of the three realms, and

¹ The four elements are the *dhātus*, earth, water, fire and air. The Chinese rendering 大 is more usually a translation of *mahābhūta*, but the meaning is the same.

² The three comparisons given here in items 12, 13, and 14 are a stock set, as discussed in detail by Lamotte (1962: 136-137, with note 28, and in 1944-80: 702-707, with notes.). In Pāli SN iv.172-74 is the *locus classicus*, and see especially 174, 22-23, 25, 32: "Four poisonous snakes of fierce might and frightful venom, monks, is a designation for the four great elements. Five executioners and enemies, monks, is a designation for the five aggregates of appropriation. An empty village, monks, is a designation of the six individual [senses]." *cattāro āsīvisā uggatejā ghoravisā ti kho bhikkhave catunnetam mahābhūtānam adhivacanam ... pañcavadhakā paccatthikā ti kho bhikkhave pañcannetam upādānakkhandhānam adhivacanam ... suñño gāmo ti kho bhikkhave channam ajjhatikānam adhivacanam*. See also VKN III §64 (Ōshika 38,20-22) and *Pratyutpanna* 2H (ed. Harrison). In the *Pratyutpanna*, moreover, the previous item, our 11, is also found directly before this list. See also RP 44.15: "The elements are similar to a snake, the aggregates are executioners, and the mind, filled with depravities, is a useless, empty village." *dhātūś ca sarpasadrśā vadhakāś ca skandhāḥ cittam ca sāsṛavam anārthakaśūnyagrāmaḥ*.

Lamotte also points in the above mentioned VKN footnote to the quotation of the *Dharmasaṃgīti-sūtra* in the First *Bhāvanākrama* of Kamalaśīla (Tucci 1958: 222,12-16): *skandheṣu māyāvat pratyavekṣanā ... dhātusv āśīviṣavat pratyavekṣanā ... āyataneṣu śūnyagrāmavat pratyavekṣanā*. But the first comparison there seems to be different from the stock expression.

After this item the Chinese translation inserts another item: "To know well skillful means."

³ Tibetan perhaps **śūnyatādhimukta*. KP §16 *śūnyatām cādhimucyate* = *stong pa nyid la yang mos pa*. Chinese "to understand the empty character of dharma." Probably 解 is intended to render *adhimukti*, although without the Tibetan for comparison one would never know this.

⁴ Chinese "gradually eliminate things one [wants to] do, and practice wishlessness."

- 22) Always exert himself as if his head or clothes were on fire,¹ and
- 23) Not lay down the burden, and
- 24) Investigate his bodily faults in accord with reality, and
- 25) See the arising and decay of mind,² and
- 26) Make an effort to comprehend suffering, and
- 27) Reject craving for all things which originate [suffering], and
- 28) Set out to realize the cessation [of suffering], and
- 29) Endeavor in the yoga of cultivating the path [to the cessation of suffering],³ and
- 30) Be settled in the applications of mindfulness in the external realm, and
- 31) Be free of bad dharma and inclined toward good dharma, and
- 32) Be well settled in correct exertion,⁴ and
- 33) Be bent on the bases of supernatural power, and
- 34) Possess the five faculties,⁵ and
- 35) Possess the five powers,⁶ and

¹ The expression is a stock phrase. See for instance SN i.108,23-24: *appam āyu manussānaṃ hiḷeyya naṃ suporiso / careyyādittasīso va natthi maccussa nāgamo ti //*. See also SN v.440, AN ii.93,18ff, and CPD s.v. ādittacela. KP §2 [3]: “Knowing that wisdom comes through great learning, he strives after learning like one whose head or clothes are on fire.” *bāhuśrutyena ca prajñāgamam veditvā ādīptaśiraścelopama śrutam paryeṣate*. The correct meaning of the expression was pointed out already in 1933 by Staël-Holstein in his edition of the KP Commentary, page v (in the Cy. itself the explanation is found on pages 27-28). The *Mañjuśrībuddhakṣetraguṇavyūha* T. 310 (XI) 342c16 in listing six types of bodhisattvas who will quickly attain complete and perfect awakening has as the second type one who, whether householder or renunciant, upholds the precepts even at the cost of his life, ... and does not give up his efforts (*vīrya*), as if his head were on fire.

² Chinese: “He should produce such attitudes as this and contemplate such dharma.” Should we imagine an expression something like **cittopatti-bhāṅga-darśana*?

³ This and the previous three items refer of course to the so-called Four Noble Truths.

⁴ **samyak-prahāṇa*.

⁵ Chinese rather “protect.”

⁶ Chinese: “obtain freedom / lordship in the five powers.”

- 36) Concentrate on the seven limbs of awakening, and
- 37) Be devoted to the eight-fold noble path,¹ and
- 38) Dwell in calming, and
- 39) Discern with insight.²

V.8

Having put on these types of armor,³ Kāśyapa, not lying down to sleep in the first half of the night or in the last watch of the night, exerting himself in yoga, he should always dwell in a wilderness abode according to his specific attainment.⁴

¹ Items 30 through 37 comprise the 37 *bodhipāṣika dharmas*: 4 *smṛtyupasthānas*, 4 *samyakprahāṇa*, 4 *ṛddhipāda*, 5 *indriya*, 5 *bala*, 7 *bodhyaṅga* and the 8-fold path.

² This and the previous item refer to *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*.

³ This is a common metaphor for the bodhisattva's "girding" himself for the spiritual battle.

⁴ Chinese has here: "he should always be mindful and desire to obtain (the?) *lokottara* dharma(s?)." The term for "specific attainment," probably *viśeṣagāmitā* or *°iva*, although it is rather common in Pāli, is quite problematic. The term appears in KP §6, where its Tibetan translation, as here, is *khyad par du 'gro ba*, which hardly helps. Prof. Nagao has referred to two passages in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*: VIII.5, with regard to the maturity of compassion (*kṛpāparipāka*) reads: *viśeṣagāmitvaṃ paripākavṛddhi-gamanāt svabhāvaḥ*, which Thurman in his unpublished translation renders "Because it furthers maturity it becomes more excellent. This is its nature." At VIII.6, with regard to the maturity of tolerance (*kṣānti*), the text says: *kṣamasya viśeṣagāmitvaṃ kuśalābhirāmāt ca karma*, which Nagao renders "One who has tolerance attains excellence and enjoys the good virtue which is its activity."

In the *Tathāgataguhyasūtra* we have the following: "These four, great King, are the four qualities which are conducive to the supreme advancements and the non-deprivation of those set out in the great vehicle. Which four? Faith, great king, is conducive to the supreme advancements and non-deprivation. Now, which faith? That faith by which one approaches the nobles, and does not do what should not be done. Respect, great king, is conducive to the supreme advancements — that respect by which one listens to what is well-spoken and obeys it and listens to the teachings with unobstructed hearing. Pridelessness, great king, is conducive to the supreme advancements — that pridelessness by which one inclines toward, salutes and will pay homage to the nobles. Energy, great king, is conducive to the supreme advancements and non-deprivation — that energy by which obtains lightness of body and lightness of mind, and carries out all that must be done. These, great king, are the four."

The passage is quoted in Sanskrit at *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 316.5-12, from which I have translated: *catvāra ime mahārāja dharmā mahāyānasamprasthitānāṃ viśeṣagāmitāyāi saṃvartante 'parihāṇāya ca / katame catvāraḥ / śraddhā mahārāja viśeṣagāmitāyāi saṃvartante 'parihāṇāya / tatra katamā śraddhāyā / yayā śraddhayā āryān upasaṃkrāmati / akaraṇīyaṃ ca na karoti // gauravaṃ mahārāja viśeṣagāmitāyāi saṃvartate / yena gauraveṇa subhāṣitam śṛṇoti śuśrūṣate 'virahitaśrotraś ca dharmam śṛṇoti // nirmānatā mahārāja viśeṣagāmitāyāi saṃvartate / yayā nirmānatayā āryāṇāṃ abhinamati prañamati namasyati // vīryaṃ mahārāja viśeṣagāmitāyāi saṃvartate 'parihāṇāya / yena vīryeṇa kāyalaghutāṃ*

V.9

If he is a dweller in that wilderness abode, he should not endeavor in efforts to adorn his body. He should not endeavor to adorn himself with his bedding. He should not adorn himself with his monastic robes. He should be a dweller in that wilderness abode taking old, dry grasses and spreading them well on the place where he walks and sits, sitting by himself, being contented with his own robes and not taking those of the local community or the universal community.

V.10

Whenever, Kāśyapa, a wilderness-dwelling monk enters a town, village, or city for the sake of alms in order to nourish his body and cultivate the noble path, he should go thither from that wilderness abode with the following state of mind:¹ Even if he does not obtain [alms] he should not be upset, and even if he does obtain them he should not be happy. He should contemplate [these results as] the maturation of acts, and he should cultivate merit. Contemplating the Tathāgata, he should enter a town, village or city for the sake of alms.²

cittalaghutāṃ ca pratilabhate sarvakāryāṇi cottārayati // ime mahārāja catvāra /. The passage is found in Chinese at T. 310 (3) (XI) 50b17-27 = T. 312 (XI) 713c17-28. In Tibetan the passage is found at Peking *dkon brtsegs, tshi*, 138a5-b3 = sTog *dkon brtsegs, ka* 176b3-177a2.

See also AKB (Pradhan 1975: 359.23), where the term *viśeṣagāmitvāt* seems to refer to the same thing, and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 191.9-10 (quoting the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*) where the implication is not entirely clear. The commentary on the latter text (Braarvig 1993: II.471, note 1) says: “specific attainment” means wisdom constantly grows greater and greater. *khyad par 'gro ba ni shes pa gong nas gong du phyir zhing cher skyes pa'o*.

¹ Chinese makes the following into an explicitly first person statement.

² See below in the notes to VI.13

V.11

When he practices begging in a town, village or city, he should practice begging having put on the armor of the Teaching. What, then, is the armor of the Teaching? If one sees with the eyes pleasant forms, one should not be attracted. If one sees unpleasant forms, one should not be hostile. Thus with pleasant and unpleasant sounds, smells, flavors, or physical sensations, one should not be attracted to or hostile to them.¹ His senses restrained, eyes averted, looking only a small distance ahead,² with a restrained and noble mind,³ not rejecting the teachings he previously contemplated, he should practice alms-begging with a disposition of mind not stolen away by worldly material possessions. He should take alms in systematic order.⁴ He should not be attracted to that place from which he obtained alms, nor should he be hostile to that place from which he did not receive them.⁵ Even if, when he has already begged at ten houses, he does not

¹ Each item is expanded one by one in the Chinese translation.

² See Mhy. 8535, 8538, 8539 for the terms *susamvṛta*, *anutkṣiptacakṣuṣa* and *yugamātradarśina* given together.

³ I follow the Sanskrit in so rendering, but the Tibetan might better be read “restrained, with a noble mind.”

⁴ Mhy. 8567, BHSD s.v. *sāvadāna*. Edgerton refers to many sources for his definition: “in regular, systematic order; chiefly of monks’ begging rounds, *uninterrupted(ly)*, going from one house to the next in order.” The same stipulation is explicitly stated in one of the *Saṃnyāsa Upaniṣads*, the *Brhat-saṃnyāsa Upaniṣad* (Schrader 1912: 265.7-8, trans. in Olivelle: 252): “At the time of begging let him not visit houses both clockwise and counterclockwise. Let him not skip foolishly a house in which there is no fault.” *naiva savyāpasavyena bhikṣākāle viśeḍ grhān / nātikrāmed grhaṃ mohād yatra doṣo na vidyate* //. Olivelle notes: “This is a prohibition against selecting houses for begging. One should go to each house on a street, moving either clockwise or counterclockwise and not erratically. One can skip a house only if it has a fault, such as impurity caused by a death or birth.” Relevant details may be found in the very detailed note in Lamotte 1962: 150, note 19.

⁵ The same idea is stated in the *Manavadharmaśāstra* 6.57: *alābhe na viśādī syāl lābhe caiva na harṣayet / prāṇayātrikamātraḥ syān mātrāsaṅgādvinirgataḥ* //. The passage is quoted in the *Nāradapari-vrājaka Upaniṣad* (Schrader 1912: 181.7-8, translated in Olivelle 1992: 203): “Let him not be elated when he receives food or be dejected when he receives not. Let him beg only as much as will sustain his life without getting attached to his belongings.”

obtain alms from the eleventh either, he should still not be upset. He should produce the calm notion that: “These brahmans and householders¹ have many things to do, and so it is not certain² that they will present [alms] to me. It is very marvellous that they even think of me, much less present alms [to me].” He should thus practice begging for alms without being discouraged.³

V.12

Whatever beings appear in his range of sight, men, women, boys, girls, even down to those who have gone to dwell in the realm of beasts, toward them he should produce a mind of love and compassion. “I shall make it such that, whatever beings appear within my range of sight or give alms [to me] shall go to heaven.” So he should endeavor.

V.13

¹ Actually the Sanskrit text here reads *śramaṇabrāhmaṇagrhapati*, which is most probably an error, motivated by the extremely regular occurrence of the expression *śramaṇabrāhmaṇa*.

² Dantinne 1991: 13 understands “il n’est pas impératif pour eux de me faire des dons,” which is also possible, but I prefer to understand *avaśyam* = *nges pa* as “certain.” Chinese seems to omit the term entirely: “These householders and brahmans, having many things to do, do not give me alms.”

³ The Sanskrit text as we have it, quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, reads *aparitapatā*, Tibetan *yongs su yi chad med pa*. If the Sanskrit reading is correct, it would suggest the meaning “feel pain, suffer,” from *pari√tap*. However, Mhy. 6813 *na paritasyati* = *yongs su yi mi chad pa*. See also BHSD s.v. *aparitasana*, *aparitasyana*, and *paritasyati* (for etymological discussion), and Wogihara 1936 (Lexicon): 32-34. It seems to me clear that rather than *pari√tap*, as the Sanskrit reads, and as *Śikṣāsamuccaya* Chinese for example seems to have understood with 憂惱 (so too apparently in Kumārajīva’s translation of the *Aṣṭa* T. 227 [VIII] 582a12 = Mitra 494.8 = Wogihara 1932-35: 943.28, 大憂愁), *√tras* as the *Ratnarāṣi* Chinese seems to understand with 驚畏, or *√hr̥s* as otherwise suggested, at least in the present context we should consider that the actual etymology must be from *√tas*. I do not know if this justifies us emending the reading of the text of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, but in any case I have translated in line with this understanding.

Whether he obtains bad¹ or good alms, he should look around everywhere in the four directions thinking: “Who is the needful poor person in this town, village or city, to whom I should distribute [food] from these alms of mine?” If he sees a poor person, he should distribute [food to him] from those alms. If he does not see [any] poor person he should think thus: “Since no one appears in my sight, I must give the best portion of my alms to those beings who have not appeared, and receiving what was given they should enjoy it.” He then takes those alms and going to that wilderness dwelling he washes his bowl and hands.² Empowered

¹ The meaning of *lūha* was pointed out already by Müller in 1903: 608; see also BHSD s.v.

² Chinese has: “having received the food, he goes to a wilderness area and washes clean his hands and feet.” Sanskrit has here only *dhautapāṇin*, with washed hands, but Tibetan has “washes his hands and bowl.” One possible and immediate explanation might be that the Chinese translators or their source confused *pātra*, bowl, with *pāda*, foot. (Note that if this were true it would argue against the source from which the Chinese translators worked being identical with Gāndhārī, in which the cluster *-tr-* tends to be retained. See Burrow 1937: 13.) But in fact, I think the explanation lies elsewhere, in the fluidity of the literary tradition.

One of our alternatives, “wash his hands and bowl,” is not only logical, but agrees exactly with the procedure specified at MN ii.13815-16, in which every action of Gotama is praised as perfectly carried out. This includes that concerning begging and receiving water with which to wash his bowl: “while washing his hands the bowl is washed; while washing the bowl his hands are washed,” *hatthesu dhotesu patto dhoto hoti. patte dhote hatthā dhotā honti*. The Chinese *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 (161) (I) 687b10-11 says the same thing, as does T. 76 (I) 884a27. CPD cites variant forms (s.v. *oṇitta* and *oṇita* and *oṇita-patta-pāṇi*), *oṇitta-patta-pāṇi* and *oṇita / oṇita-patta-pāṇi*, but gives them different translations. The first is rendered “with hands and bowl washed,” the second “with hand removed from the bowl.” The remark in the entry s.v. *oṇita* is probably correct, however, namely that both compounds (*bahuvrīhis*) in fact mean the same thing, “with hands and bowl washed.” (See CPD for references.) The suggestion in the same remark that the derivation from *apanita* is less likely than that from *avanita* is challenged by the actual occurrence in Sanskrit of the expression with *apa-*. (Both *apa-* and *ava-* give Middle Indic initial *o-*.) The *Mahā-pari-nirvāṇasūtra* (Waldschmidt 1950-51: §6.9, 12.5, 26.17) has *dhautahastam apanitapātram*, “with washed hands and bowl put away.” (I owe this reference to Skilling 1991: 155.) Further examples are cited in Waldschmidt 1973- s.v. *apanita-pātra*.

On the other hand, Thig 410 refers to a nun’s washing her hands and feet upon approaching her husband. (The text of the verse is problematic; see the Oldenberg and Pischel 1883: 240, and Norman 1971 ad Thig 410.) More to the point perhaps, the Pāli Vinaya (ii.216,20ff. [*Cullavagga* VII.5.3]) notes that it is the duty of the first monk to return from the alms round to ready a seat and the water and stool for foot washing. See also Vin. i.350,19-20 (*Mahāvagga* X.4.1). The *Samyuktāgama* T. 99 (1144) (II) 302c21-22 has the expression: 阿難舉衣鉢洗足已至尊者摩訶迦葉所, namely that Ānanda, with robe and bowl and having washed his feet, approached Mahākāśyapa. (Not in the Pāli parallel at SN ii.218,1ff.) In the **Abhinīṣkramaṇasūtra* T. 190 (III) 860b18, after eating and drinking is finished the Buddha and the community wash clean their hands and feet 淨洗手足.

I think we can reasonably conclude, then, that there is a divergence in the tradition concerning the

by good practice, endowed with the śramaṇa practice and good conduct,¹ sitting on his haunches he should consume those alms. Having eaten, without desiring, without injuring, not longing, without being greedy, he should think: "In this body there are eighty thousand families of worms,² and by this force [of eating]

cliché, with several possible variants: either the bowl and hands are washed, the hands washed and the bowl put away, or the hands and feet washed. When different recensions of the text one is translating have different variants of the cliché, as is true in the present case, one must just pick one and note the others; there is no way to assign priority to one reading as preferable to others.

¹ The equivalence between the Tibetan and Sanskrit texts here is not completely clear. We might render the Sanskrit: "Taking his alms and going to that wilderness area, with washed hands, with purified good conduct, endowed with the practices and behaviors [fitting to a] śramaṇa, empowered with power, folding his legs he should consume his alms."

² The 80,000 worms is a well known classification. See Lamotte 1944-80: 1188, note 2, in which he refers to the *Avataṃsaka* T. 297 (X) 112c9-18 = T. 278 (IX) 476b9-17 [my translation is indebted to that of Cleary 1984-87: I.489]: "What is the bodhisattva's partial giving? This bodhisattva by nature is compassionate and kind, and practices giving. If he receives flavorful food, he does not accept it for himself, but rather gives it to beings and only then does he himself eat. And so it is with everything that he may receive. When he eats, he thinks as follows: 'In my body there are eighty-thousand worms, and they live depending on me. If my body is satisfied, they are also satisfied, and if I suffer, they suffer too. I wish that this food and drink which I now receive may be able to satisfy all beings. I eat this in order to give it to them, not because I lust for the flavor.' And again he thinks: 'In the long night [of ignorance] being attached to this body I eat and drink desiring to satisfy it. Now I give this food to beings, wishing that I may cut off lust and attachment in my body forever.' This is called partial giving."

The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* says: "Again, all those eighty thousand families of worms which inhabit the bodies of other beings do not inhabit his body in any way, shape or form. Why? Since his roots of good raise him over the whole world." Mītra 326 = Wogihara 671: *yāni khalu punar anyeṣāṃ sattvānāṃ āśītiḥ kṛmikulasaḥsraṇi kāye sambhavanti tāni tasya kāye sarveṇa sarvaṃ sarvathā sarvaṃ na sambhavanti / tat kasya hetoḥ / tathā hi tasya tāni kuśalamūlāni sarvalokābhyaṅgatāni bhavanti /*. See also Conze 1975: 391.

A passage from the *Udayanavatsarājaparipṛcchā* is cited in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 81.15: "Fools do not see the eighty thousand families of worms staying inside them, [since they are] covered by nets of delusion." *āśītiḥ kṛmikulasaḥsraṇi yāni tiṣṭhanti antare / atha bālā na paśyanti mohajālena āvṛtāḥ //*. The passage is found at T. 310 (29) (XI) 545c26 = T333 (XII) 75b26 [missing in T. 332 ?]. In the *Vinaya-kṣudrakavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya (T. 1451 [XXIV] 286c24-25) the monks ask the Buddha how they can carry out a cremation of a body, when it is filled with the 80,000 worms. The Buddha responds that the worms die when the body dies. (The passage has been translated from Chinese by Anna Seidel in *Hōbōgirin* 578a, and from Tibetan by Gregory Schopen 1992: 16; see also La Vallée Poussin, 1937: 286).

Lamotte (see above), among other references, also referred to the *Visuddhimagga* (ed. Warren and Kosambi 1950: 193-94, trans. Ñāṇamoli 1956: I.253): "This body is shared by many. Firstly, it is shared by the eighty families of worms" Much more detailed is the account in the **Vimuttimaggā* T. 1648 (XXXII) 433b20-434a11 (trans. Ehara et al. 1977: 174-76). One may also consult Bapat 1933-34.

Lin Li-kouang 1949 109-111 discusses in detail the question of "worm lists" and the different traditions found in various texts, concluding that there at least two different lists of the 80 [000] worms. It seems there is some variance between 80 versus 80,000.

they shall dwell happily.¹ Now I shall attract them with material means. [But] having obtained awakening I shall attract them with the teachings.”²

V.14

If, now, he gets poor alms he should think: “By this poor food my body too shall become light, and I will be patient with my renunciation, the output of my feces and urine will become small, and gifts of faith to me will become few.³ Both my body and my mind too will become light. I will come to have little torpor and drowsiness, and I will not be possessed by a mind of passion.” Thus he should think.

V.15

If he obtains generous alms, even then he should eat moderately. He should also follow the rule of giving things away, and placing some of those alms atop a suitable slab of rock he should think: “May whatever groups of animals and birds

A lengthy passage in the *Garbhāvakrānti-sūtra* gives a very detailed breakdown of the types of worms included in the number 80,000, where they live in the body and what they eat. T. 310 (13) [XI] 325a15-b28 = *sTog ga* 382a7ff. = T. 310 (14) [XI] 331b1-c22 = *sTog ga* 409b6ff. Just to give the flavor of the passage, I translate the first few lines. “Seven days after birth there appear in the body 80,000 families of worms. They eat it from top to bottom, side to side. Ānanda. There is one worm family called ‘hair eater.’ It dwells at the root of the hair and is always eating that hair. There are two [more] worm families. One is called ... etc.” It is interesting to note that this passage is quoted in the *Ōjōyōshu* T. 2682 (LXXXIV) 38b5ff. The *Ajātaśatru sūtra* T. 507 (XIV) 775a18-19 has it that the body has 80,000 pores, each of which is filled with 100 worms.

On *krimi*, see further Zysk 1985: 64-69, 188-90, and Müller 1964.

¹ On this expression, *sukkaṃ phāsum vihar*, see Caillat 1960, 1961.

² A close parallel to this passage is found in the “Twelve Dhūtaguṇa sūtra” 十二頭陀經, quoted in the Introduction.

³ Chinese of the *Ratnarāśi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* omit “gifts of faith to me will become few.”

desire material food receive what is given [here] and eat this [food].”

V.16

Having eaten and washed his begging bowl and hands,¹ he should resort to his wilderness and dwell there. And he shall not he cast aside that way of acting which he previously contemplated.

V.17

If,² Kāśyapa, snakes and ferocious beasts approach the wilderness dwelling śramaṇa who has not yet attained the fruit, who is an ordinary being,³ he shall not fear or be afraid of them, but he shall think: “From the very outset forsaking my body and life I came to dwell in the wilderness, so I should not be afraid, not be scared. Rather, I should produce a loving mind, I should thoroughly remove hatred,⁴ I should remove fear.” If having done so still those snakes and beasts deprive him of life and eat him, he should think: “I cannot satisfy these beasts merely with food, but eating my flesh they will dwell happily in a state of comfort,⁵ and I too will obtain a good reward, that is, from an insubstantial body

¹ Chinese adds: “he rinses clean his bowl and wipes it dry with his hands. Then he hangs up his outer cloak, (and resorts to his wilderness to practice).”

² Chinese adds: “when he is practicing the wilderness dwelling practice.”

³ “Ordinary being” is a technical term, *prthagjana*. The wilderness dweller, then, is technically one who is not an *ārya*, noble. A detailed scholastic discussion may be found in AKB i.191ff., and see the index to La Vallée Poussin 1923-31 s.v.

⁴ Notice the interesting use in Sanskrit of the Prakritic form *doṣa* for *dveṣa*.

⁵ The reference here is to an *ātmatyāga*, a gift of one's self, one's own body. Perhaps the most famous example is the so-called Tiger jātaka. For references see Lamotte 1944-80: 143, and notes. For the story of King Śibi's gift of his own flesh, with copious references, see Lamotte 1944-80: 255-60, and notes.

I will obtain an essence.¹ Now, I shall attract them with material means. [But]

¹ The order of clauses in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and Chinese of the *Ratnarāṣi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* differs from that in Tibetan: “If having done so still those snakes and beasts deprive him of life and eat him, he should think: “I will obtain a good reward, that is, from an insubstantial body I will obtain an essence. I cannot satisfy these beasts merely with food, but eating my flesh they will dwell happily in a state of comfort.” Sanskrit has the expressions in the first person: “deprive me of life, I should think”

I was long puzzled about how to understand the term “essence,” *sāra* = *snying po*, here. The Chinese does not really help: 以不堅身當得堅身, “from a non-firm body I will obtain a firm body.” I once wondered whether there might be a reference here to the idea mentioned in Dhṛ 11 = Uv 29.03: “Those who imagine an essence in what is without an essence, who envision no essence in what has an essence, do not understand the essence, they roam in the field of perverted imagination.” *asāre sāmāmatino sāre cāsārādassino / te sāmān nādhigacchanti micchāsāṅkhappagocarā //*. In canonical Pāli, as far as I know body (*kāya*) is characterized as *asāra* only in Thig 458 and 501. LV 242.15 and SuvPr 57.14 also refer to the body as *asāraka*. These ideas are, of course, conventional and not surprising. On the other hand, the idea of a body which has a transcendent essence seems to be rather common in the *Tathāgata-garbha* literature. Takasaki 1974: 137 quotes the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* as saying that the bodies of the gods, humans and asuras are all, except for the *tathāgata-garbha* (*de bzhin gshegs pa'i snying po*), without any pith (*snying po*), like a bamboo or reed.

I was not satisfied with these references, and did not consider the expression explained. I now believe, however, that I can offer a credible explanation for the expression by reference to a passage in the *Ugradattapariṣcchā*:

[One produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial body, [one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial life, and [one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from insubstantial possessions. How is it that “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial body”? Feeling the inclination to do the task of another, and speaking respectfully to gurus, honoring them, bowing to them, doing obeisance to them, and saluting them — this is how “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial body.” How is it that “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial life”? Not spoiling roots of good created in past [lives], but increasing them more and more — this is how “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial life.” How is it that “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from insubstantial possessions”? Destroying stingy thoughts, and increasing great generosity, distributing gifts — this is how “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from insubstantial possessions.

sTog 8b7-9a6, Peking 301b3-8: *snying po med pa'i lus las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa dang / snying po med pa'i srog las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa dang / snying po med pa'i longs spyod rnam las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa yin no // de la snying po med pa'i lus las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa gang zhe na / gang gzhan gyi bya'o cog bya bar spro ba dang / bla ma rnam la gus par smra ba dang / phyag 'tshal ba dang / ldang ba dang / thal mo sbyar ba dang / 'dud pa'i las byed pa ste / 'di ni snying po med pa'i lus las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa zhes bya'o // de la snying po med pa'i srog las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa gang zhe na / gang ngon byas pa'i dge ba'i rtsa ba rnam yongs su mi nyams la / gong du yang rnam par 'phel bar byed pa ste / 'di ni snying po med pa'i srog las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa zhes bya'o // de la snying po med pa'i longs spyod rnam las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa gang zhes na / gang ser sna'i sems tshar gcod cing / gtong ba chen po'i sems 'phel bar byed cing sbyin pa yang dag par 'ged pa ste / 'di ni snying po med pa'i longs spyod rnam las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa zhes bya'o //*. The Chinese texts are: T. 310 (19) (XI) 473b26-c4, T. 322 (XII) 16c9-19, T. 323 (XII) 24b5-12.

It seems to me that we may thus legitimately understand the expression here in the *Ratnarāṣi* by reference to this passage: the opportunity to create something essential and solid (spiritually speaking) is created through encounters with what is insubstantial in the world. By using one's body, which is of course insubstantial, to do work for others, or in respectful attendance upon a teacher, as in the *Ugra*, or by

having attained awakening, I shall attract them with the Teaching.”¹ The monk, Kāśyapa, who dwells in the wilderness should dwell in the wilderness thus, without regard for his body or his life.

V.18

If while he is dwelling in that wilderness abode non-humans come [there], whether they are attractive or repulsive, he should neither be attracted to them nor should he be repulsed by them.

V.19

If gods who have seen a former Buddha² approach the wilderness monk and ask him a question, then that wilderness monk should preach the Teaching to those gods according to how he has learned it.³ If, however, those gods ask a profound question, and the answer is not evident to the wilderness monk, he must be

offering the body as food, as in the *Ratnarāṣi*, one takes the opportunity provided by the insubstantial to use it as a medium for realizing the substantial, which is spiritual progress. Seen in this light this is certainly one of the more beautiful and profound passages in the sūtra.

It may be possible to confirm this reading by reference to the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya T. 1428 (XXII) 587a27-28, in which Dravya Mallaputra expresses his desire to use his insubstantial body in a way that will assure him of substantiality 此身不牢固。我今當以力方便求牢固法耶。 He therefore volunteers to take care of administrative tasks such as the assignment of lodging to monks.

¹ Chinese omits: “Now, I shall attract them with food. After attaining awakening, I shall attract them with the Teaching.”

² The reference here is extremely interesting. The implication of the passage is that there are gods, who are of course often extremely long lived, who might have met the Buddha, and directly heard his teachings. The humble monk, perhaps being tested by these gods, then is instructed to solicit them for their instruction in the case that his own learning is insufficient. The passage and the idea deserves to be explored further.

³ Sanskrit “according to his ability, according to his strength, according to his spiritual realization of the dharma.”

without pride and say: “You should not despise one who is unlearned. Having orally received the Buddha’s teachings, when with effort I come to fully understand those which I do not [now] fully understand, then I will respond to all your questions. With me as the learner of the Teaching, please practice eloquence [expounding the teaching for me].”¹ Kāśyapa, the wilderness monk should explain thus to the gods.²

V.20

Moreover, Kāśyapa, the wilderness monk who dwells in the wilderness shall intensely cultivate the notion of the wilderness. For him this body is similar to grasses, trees, a wall, a clod of dirt, or an illusion, and is without master, possessions or chattels.³ This body is without self, living being, life, or person, and these dharmas are dependently co-arisen; arising from causes and conditions, they are produced from the agglomeration of causes. As he pacifies all items of wrong speculation on a self, so he shall correctly understand by himself. He shall uninterruptedly concentrate on the teachings of emptiness, the signless and the wishless. Thinking thus he should practice.

¹ The addition in brackets is based on the Chinese. The technical term here, “eloquence,” is *pratiḥbhā*, on which see Braarvig 1985 and MacQueen 1981, 1982.

² Chinese has the last sentence as: “He should be grateful for their generosity and say: I beg you not to despise me.”

³ The *Daśabhūmika* (Kondo 1936: 24.6-7) has: “[Though the *duḥkhaskandha* is] without self or what belongs to a self, empty, vain, void, inactive, motionless, like senseless grass, a piece of wood, a plaster wall, a hide or a reflection, still they do not comprehend it thus.” *ātmātmīyavigato riktatucchaḥ śūnyo nirīho niśceṣṭo jadatrṇakāṣṭhakudyacarmapratibhāsopamo na caivam avabudhyanta iti*. See also the next note.

V.21

The one who dwells in that wilderness abode, [wondering] how those grasses, clumps of trees, herbs and woods, arise and how they will decay, recognizes the fact that as these external entities are masterless, without possessions and without chattels, so they are motionless and actionless; and arising and decaying in an empty manner, no one produces them and no one destroys them. In just the same way one should recognize the fact that this body too is like the grasses, a wall, a tree, a clod of dirt, or an illusion, being masterless, without possessions, without chattels, motionless, actionless, arisen from an agglomeration of causes and conditions, and when causes and conditions are not complete unarisen; ultimately there is nothing here which is arisen or destroyed.”¹

¹ An almost exact parallel is found in the *Ugradattapariṣeṣā*: “For example, Householder, grasses, shrubs, herbal plants, and trees inhabiting the wilderness are not terrified, not frightened, not scared, not afflicted by fear. Just so, Householder, the renunciant bodhisattva dwelling in a wilderness must think of his body as like the grasses, shrubs, herbal plants, trees, a piece of wood or a plaster wall, that is, as an illusion. (That is: He must consider it as just like an illusion.) Who is terrified here? Who is frightened here? That one who is frightened by fear or scared must correctly examine the body as follows: Here in the body there is no self, or living being, or life-form, or human, or person, or man, or human being. This is imagination of the unreal, namely fear itself. I must not conceptualize that imagination of the unreal. Therefore, as grasses, shrubs, herbal plants, and trees inhabit a wilderness without owning anything, without belongings, just so must I dwell, without owning anything and without belongings, understanding and realizing that all things are nothing but a wilderness. Why? Dwelling in a wilderness is the cutting off of passions, the absence of ownership, the absence of belongings.”

The text is quoted *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 199.3-12, from which I translate: *tadyathā gṛhapate 'raṇye tṛṇagulmauśadhivanaspatayaḥ prativāsanto na bibhyati nottrasyanti na samtrasyanti na samtrāsam āpadyante / evam eva gṛhapate pravrajitena bodhisatvenārāṇye viharatā tṛṇagulmauśadhivanaspatikāṣṭha-kuḍyavad ātmapratibhāsavat saṃjñā kāye utpādayitavyā / māyāsamatā cittasyotpādayitavyā / ko 'tra bibheti ko 'sminn uttrasyati / tena bhayaabhītena vā trāstena vā evaṃ yoniśaḥ kāya upapariṅṣitavyaḥ / nāsty atra kāye ātmā vā satvo vā jīvo vā poṣo vā pudgalo vā manujo vā mānavo vā / abhūtaparikalpa eṣa yad uta bhayaṃ nāma / sa mayā 'bhūtaparikalpo na parikalpayitavyaḥ / tena yathārāṇye tṛṇagulmauśadhivanaspatayaḥ prativāsanti amamā aparigrahāḥ / evam evāmamenāparigraheṇārāṇyam eva sarva-dharmā iti jñātvā upasampadya vihartavyam / tat kasya hetoḥ / raṇachedo 'raṇyavāso 'mamo 'parigrahāḥ //* Along with the Sanskrit, the Tibetan and Chinese texts are quoted in Mochizuki 1988: 284-304 (the passage in question is his paragraph D). The Chinese is found at T. 310 (19) (XI) 478b19-c6 = T. 323 (XII) 29a5-22 = T. 322 (XII) 20c19-21a17. The Tibetan is found at Peking 325b2ff.

[Two remarks: First, I believe that the clause I have placed in parentheses is an attempt to explain the preceding and enigmatic *ātmapratibhāsavat*. The gloss (as I understand it) is not rendered in the Tibetan quoted by Mochizuki. Second, note that the final sentence appears to contain a pun or folk etymology of *ārāṇya*, namely using *araṇa*, and it is hard to imagine that the ancient authors were not at least aware of the

V.22

Thus, Kāśyapa, the wilderness monk should dwell in the wilderness undertaking the practice of such courses of behavior as these.¹ Those dwelling in modes of behavior like that are rapidly distinguished into followers of the vehicle of the auditors, followers of the vehicle of the lone buddhas, or followers of the vehicle of the bodhisattvas.² If [the wilderness monk] should be a follower of the vehicle of the auditors, he will quickly obtain the fruit [of the śramaṇa]. Even if he is obstructed by karmic obstructions and he does not obtain the fruit [in the present life],³ it will not take more than the time of two or three Tathāgatas until his mind will be liberated from the depravities.⁴ If he should be a follower of the vehicle of lone buddhas, he will rapidly become a lone buddha.⁵ If he should be a follower of the vehicle of the bodhisattvas, right now [during this lifetime] he will attain the tolerance of the fact that [all] things are unproduced.⁶ He will see the Buddha⁷ without hindrance. And having seen the Buddha without hindrance

“confusion” between the two terms, if not actually intentionally utilizing it.

¹ I am not sure that I have correctly understood *chos kyi yi dam gyi spyod pa*, perhaps **dharmasamādānacaryā*.

² Chinese omits “Those dwelling in modes of behavior like that are rapidly distinguished into followers of the vehicle of the auditors, followers of the vehicle of the lone buddhas, or followers of the vehicle of the bodhisattvas.”

³ Addition in brackets based on Chinese.

⁴ On this last expression, see the footnote to section V.23.

⁵ Chinese omits “If he should be a follower of the vehicle of lone buddhas he will rapidly become a lone buddha.” It is no doubt significant that the Chinese translation, the older of the two versions of the sūtra by far, and clearly containing fewer interpolations than the Tibetan text, omits this reference to the pratyekabuddha.

⁶ We have here, of course, one of the key ideas in Mahāyāna Buddhism, the *anutpattika-dharmakṣānti*. See Lamotte 1962: 411-13 (Appendix, note 3).

⁷ Chinese: “future buddhas,” marking the plural explicitly. There is no indication of plural in the Tibetan.

he will quickly attain to unexcelled perfect awakening.¹

V.23

When this chapter on the wilderness dweller had been preached, the minds of five hundred monks, free from clinging, became liberated from the depravities.²

The Chapter on the Wilderness Dweller; The Fifth.

¹ A close parallel is found in the 十二頭陀經 T. 783 (XVII) 720b24-27. The Buddha smiles, and upon Mahākāśyapa asking the reason for his smile, he says: "I look at the wilderness dwelling and see that all the buddhas of the ten directions extol it. It produces infinite merits for all. Those who seek to become auditors will obtain the vehicle of the auditors, those who seek to become lone buddhas will obtain the vehicle of the lone buddhas, and those who seek to become Mahāyānists will quickly obtain unexcelled perfect awakening. Because I now dwell here [in the wilderness] I am happy [and hence my smile]."

² This expression is part of a stock phrase: *anupādāyāsravebhyaś cittāni vimuktāni*, KP 138, 145, SP 179.17, RP 59.19, and in Pāli at DhA i.86,7: *yāva me anupādāya āsevehi cittaṃ vimuccati*. See von Simson 1965 §17.9. It is peculiar that the renderings of what is basically the same expression (with or without *anupādāya*) in V.22 and 23 of the Chinese differ from each other: 得斷一切諸漏 and 斷一切漏心得解脫, respectively.

The English Translation: Chapter Six

<Alms Begging Practice>

VI.1

Now, Kāśyapa, how is a monk one who practices alms-begging? In this regard, Kāśyapa, the monk who practices alms-begging should consider thus: “I dwell on alms food, and having made renunciation into the well-spoken Dharma and Vinaya, I should dwell in [accord with] my previous vows and promises.”¹ That monk who possesses the earnest aspiration to practice alms begging should not be greedy,² should be without deception, without boasting, without any wish for any invitation, should not cling to the possessions of the community, and should be firm in his vows.³

VI.2

In absolutely no way should he have any ideas about taste with regard to good foods. He should train himself, thinking thus:⁴ “In this way I should be like an

¹ Chinese has the clause from “In this regard” as: “If there is a monk who previously established a vow, saying: ‘I renounce the world and live by alms begging. I now dwell according to this former vow.’” The crucial term here and in the Tibetan is *pūrvapraṇidhāna*. It is odd to notice that it is rendered twice in Chinese in the same sentence in two different ways: 本誓 and 先誓. See Fujita 1970: 379ff, and Hiraoka 1988.

² Chinese omits “not greedy.”

³ Chinese has understood the last expression as “firmly adorns himself,” and the explanation for this provides an opportunity to illustrate the probable Prakritic background of the Chinese translators’ text. I have discussed the problem in the Introduction.

⁴ Chinese has “He should train himself, thinking thus” as: “With regard to the best food, he should endeavor in his mind to contemplate thus.”

outcaste¹ and purify my body and mind, but I should not purify my body with food. Why? No matter how good the food that is eaten, it all ultimately flows out as pus. Ultimately it is disagreeable. Ultimately it is evil-smelling. Therefore I should not desire good food.”

VI.3

With such very profound concentration of his thoughts,² when he enters a village, town or city in search of alms he shall beg in systematic order. He may think thus:³ “A man gives alms to me, not a woman. Or, a woman gives alms to me, not a man. Or, a boy gives alms to me, not a girl. Or, a girl gives alms to me, not a boy. Or, I obtain something good, not something poor.⁴ Or, I obtain [alms] with respect, not with disrespect.⁵ Or, I obtain [alms] easily, not with exhausting difficulty.⁶ Or, men, women, boys and girls will come to welcome

¹ The Sanskrit text has *caṇḍālakumāra*. Most Tibetan versions translate *gdol pa*, **caṇḍāla*, but a few (D, J, Śikṣ D, P) render more literally *gdol bu*. Chinese supports only **caṇḍāla*. The term *caṇḍālakumāraka* appears in Pāli (AN iv.376,11), where however it is paired with *caṇḍālakumārīkā*, — in other words, the reference is clearly to boys and girls. (The passage occurs in Chinese in the *Ekottarāgama* T. 125 [37.6] [II] 713a24, and *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 [3.24] [I] 453a11; the first specifies only **caṇḍālakumārīkā* while the second has only **caṇḍālakumāraka*.)

² **nidhyaptacitta*.

³ The Sanskrit has: “he should not think thus.”

⁴ Chinese has two expressions here apparently corresponding to a single expression in Sanskrit and Chinese: “I will obtain fine food, not coarse food; I will obtain sumptuous food, not poor food.” Neither of the Chinese translations, for “fine food” 細食 or “sumptuous food” 美食, is the same as that used in IV.4, 好食, where the same Sanskrit term as that used here, *praṇīta*, appears. Here the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* translation has 美食, but at IV.4 it reads 美膳.

⁵ Edgerton suggested, BHSD s.v. *satkṛtya*, that the term might mean “carefully, thoroughly, zealously,” but at least in the present case the Tibetan rendering *bsti stang du byas na rnyed kyi bsti stang du ma byas par ni ma yin* no suggests that “respectfully,” or even “having honored [the donor],” might be better. Chinese seems not to render the expression.

⁶ From here, for the rest of the paragraph, the ordering of clauses in the Sanskrit text differs from the Tibetan. Note that the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, which is quoting the Tibetan translation of the *Ratnarāṣi*, follows the order of clauses in the latter, not the order of clauses in the Sanskrit text. The Sanskrit reads: “As soon as I arrive, they will concentrate their attentions on me; there will be no neglect of

me. Or, as soon as I arrive, they will concentrate their attentions on me. Or, I must be paid attention to. Or, I will obtain what is well prepared. Or, I will obtain sumptuous food possessing a variety of flavors, but I will not obtain inferior food such as that of poor people.”¹ He should not produce all these bad mental reflections.

VI.4

It is the normal way of things² for alms begging monks that they should gird on armor such as this, that they should not be troubled whether they receive [alms] or do not, and that they should not have any idea that [the alms] are good or bad. Why? Beings for the most part are greedy for savories, and performing evil actions for the sake of food, they are then born in the hells.³ Those beings who are content, not greedy, not longing, not covetous of savories, content with their sense of taste, living on even the poorest food, die, and after they die they will be reborn in heaven; they will reach a happy state among gods and men, and having

me. I will obtain what is well prepared. I will obtain sumptuous food possessing a variety of flavors; I will not obtain inferior, poor food. Men, women, boys and girls will come to welcome me.” Chinese has, for the comparable section: “I should be given alms intentionally, not unintentionally. I should obtain alms easily, not with difficulty. I should quickly obtain alms, not slowly. Entering a village I should obtain respectful honor, not disrespect. I should obtain new food, not leftovers. I should obtain food from rich houses, not from poor ones. Groups of men, women, boys and girls will come to welcome me.” The Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* seems to be corrupt here, and I cannot easily sort it out, although Nakano 1935: 101 has read it as it stands. At the very least I suspect that the order of the clauses has become confused. See the edition of the Chinese text.

¹ Unless I have misunderstood the translation, the Tibetan *dbul po'i (kha) zas lta bu ngan pa* seems to gloss *hīnadaridrābhojanam* as **hīnam bhojanam daridrasya iva*. (I purposely do not apply sandhi.) The Sanskrit means not “inferior food of poor people,” but “inferior, poor food.” This is, I suspect, the preferable understanding, but the Chinese quoted in the previous note suggests that it is certainly not the only possible reading.

² **dharmatā*. Chinese has 常所行法, which is a bit problematic.

³ Chinese adds: “or realm of the beasts or hungry ghosts.”

been born as gods they will consume ambrosial nectar.¹

VI.5

A monk, Kāśyapa, who practices alms begging, doing away with desire for savories and with profound concentration of his thoughts, should not be disheartened, even if he [must] pass seven days eating [only] gruel.² Why? Because he thinks: “I will eat³ food in order to nourish my body and accumulate the elements of the noble path.”⁴

¹ On the notion of being reborn in heaven consuming ambrosia, here *sudhā* but perhaps more commonly *amṛta*, see the episode in the Mūla-Sarvāstivāda Vinaya (Sanskrit Gnoli 1978: 155.23-159.10; Chinese due to Yijing 義淨 T. 1450 [XXIV] 189c1-190b23). I have discussed this story in detail in my paper on the origins of the *Guan Wulaingshuo-jing*, in preparation. In both the *Ratnarāśi* and the *Śikṣā-samuccaya* *sudhā* is translated into Chinese as 天美食. The term is used in the so-called Buddhist creation myth in the 起世因本經 T. 25 (I) 400c13, where we find 天須陀之味, and likewise *sudhā* is described as a heavenly food which comes from trees in the *Yogācārabhūmi* T. 1579 (XXX) 298a29-b2; it is of four kinds, blue, yellow, red and white. I have noticed in Yamabe 1993: 34 that the term 天須陀味 also appears in the *Guanfo sanmei hai-jing* 觀佛三昧海經 T. 643 (XV) 680b24.

² The exact sense of *kulmāṣa* (the form *kulmāsa* is also found) is not quite clear, but it may be something like a half-cooked pulse. Dictionaries define the word as gruel or half-cooked rice and pulse (peas, beans, etc.). The Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi* has “beans,” and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* “cooked beans.” Other Buddhist texts in Chinese also seem to render it in ways that suggest rice or beans was understood: see Wogihara 1964-74, s.v. *kulmāṣa*. It is less likely to mean rice, however, since we find terms such as *odanakulmāsa*, rice and beans, for example in the KP §152 (*odanakulmāsopacitaḥ*). Mhy. 5747 has Tibetan *zan dron* which seems to mean simply “warm food,” or a food made of hot, ground up tsampa, but the *Ratnarāśi* has *lhad zan*. I have not, so far, noticed this equivalent elsewhere. Note that the variant reading *lhag zan*, “left-over food,” seems to be a *lectio facillior*. It is worth drawing attention to the remark of D.D. Kosambi 1963: 184 that, whatever the technical identification of *kulmāṣa* may be, all indications point to it as the lowest, most humble type of food. Thus, the indication that the monk is reduced to eating this type of fare is significant.

The Tibetan qualifies the gruel with the expression *zhag bdun lon pa za yang*, but the Sanskrit has *suparipakvān*, in other words “well cooked.” Chinese supports the Tibetan, rendering “if one eats beans for seven days.” I do not know how to explain the Sanskrit text, if it is, as I suspect, a graphic or phonological error (for **saptāha-* or **saptadivasa-* ?)

³ Sanskrit has “should eat.”

⁴ Compare a passage in the AN ii.40,4-13: “And how, monks, is a monk one who knows the proper amount with respect to food? In this regard, monks, a monk consumes his food with proper care and attention, not for fun, to indulge, for adornment, or ornamentation, but just in order to maintain and nourish this body, to desist from violence and to encourage the life of purity. Therefore, I shall destroy any old feeling and not produce any anew. And I will live long, be irreproachable, and dwell in ease. Thus, monks,

VI.6

A monk, Kāśyapa, who practices alms begging should eat what comes into his alms bowl, what is put into his alms bowl, which conforms to the Teaching, which is lawfully acquired, sharing it out with the monks who keep to the practice of purity.

VI.7

If, Kāśyapa, a monk who practices alms begging should fall sick, and being without a nurse¹ he is unable to go on his begging rounds, he should think² as follows: “I am friendless, I am alone, unaccompanied. I have renounced the home life. The Teaching is my friend, and I take my refuge in the Teaching.³ Since I am unhappy, suffering and sick, I should correctly pay attention,⁴ according to how I have heard them, to the teachings taught by the Tathāgata as the medicine of the Teaching.”

a monk knows the proper amount with respect to food” *kathañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhu bhojane mattaññu hoti. idha bhikkhave bhikkhu paṭisaṅkhā yoniso āhāraṃ āhāreti. neva davāya na madāya na maṇḍanāya na vibhūsanāya yāvad eva imassa kāyassa ṭhitiyā yāpanāya vihiṃsūparitīyā brahmacariyānuggahāya. iti purāṇaṃ ca vedanaṃ paṭisaṅkhāmi navaṃ ca vedanaṃ na uppādessāmi yātrā ca me bhavissati anavajjatā ca phāsuvihāro cāti. evaṃ kho bhikkhave bhikkhu bhojane mattaññu hoti.* (This passage is also quoted by Dantinne 1991: 62-63)

¹ **upasthāyaka*. See BHSD s.v. *upasthāyaka*, CPD s.v. *upaṭṭhāka*. It is also possible that the Tibetan *nad g-yog* is intended for *glānopasthāyaka*, but Chinese 使人 suggests that *upasthāyaka* without *glāna* was in the original from which the Chinese was translated. Even without *glāna*, *upasthāyaka* means one who takes care of the sick.

² Chinese has “should profoundly concentrate his thoughts,” **nidhyaptacitta*-.

³ Chinese has “I should be mindful of the Teachings” for “I take my refuge in the Teaching.”

⁴ **yonīsa-upalakṣitavya*, Mhy. 7454. The subject of this sentence in Chinese is “monks,” not “I”: “Monks should be mindful of the Teachings as the Blessed One taught them.”

VI.8

Now, Kāśyapa, this true comprehensive reflection¹ about what this body is is correct application.² If one truly comprehensively reflects on this body as a disadvantage,³ he correctly comprehends. And making his mind single pointed he will become mindful and constantly attentive,⁴ and thus the stage of generating the first Concentration will be his.⁵ Having obtained the Concentration, if he desires the bliss of Concentration, he dwells in the enjoyment of the bliss of Concentration for the space of one day, or two days, or from three days up to seven days.⁶ If, even entered into yoga, he is not able to generate the Concentration, then gods, nāgas and yakṣas renowned for their superior knowledge⁷ will offer food to that yogācārin monk, striving in that manner, who dwells in the Teaching. Why? Because it is the natural outcome of yogic practices that he obtain what was possessed by the gods.⁸

¹ *bhūtapratyavekṣā. See KP §52 and following for a discussion of “true comprehensive reflection.”

² *yonisaḥ pravyūj. See RP 12.9 yonisaḥ prayujyate = tshul bzhin rab tu sbyor. This sentence in the Chinese translation runs: “I should correctly consider the teachings I have heard. How should I correctly consider? By true comprehensive reflection on the body.”

³ It is also possible that this may mean “reflect on the faults in this body.” The term kāyadosa is found in Pāli at AN i.112,35ff, but it is not clear whether the signification is the same. Chinese omits this expression.

⁴ The pair of *smṛti* and *samprajanya* appeared above in I.2 (22).

⁵ *prathamadhyāna.

⁶ In the standard definition of the first Concentration (see BHSD s.v. dhyāna), the enjoyment of bliss, *prītisukha*, is one of its characteristics. Such a definition is pan-Buddhist.

⁷ *abhijñānābhijñā. Both Chang et al. 1983: 306 and Nagai 1932: 247 have misunderstood 多人所知, an attempt to translate *abhijñānābhijñā* or *abhijñātābhijñā*. On this — in certain ways problematic — term, see Fujita 1970: 185 and 1975: 179-80. The expression has two apparently possible interpretations: 1) renowned for superior knowledge (as Tibetan here takes it), or 2) famous (as Chinese here takes it). Compare BHSD s.v. abhijñāta.

⁸ Chinese has the final two sentences as: “If the alms begging monk practices such teachings as this but still does not obtain the Concentration, he should make an effort to practice and establish himself in the

VI.9

If there is a time, Kāśyapa, when because clouds gather and it rains,¹ the monk who practices alms begging is unable to enter upon his begging rounds, then he girds on the armor of the food of friendliness² and fixed in mindfulness of thoughts about the Teaching, if he has no food for two or three nights, he should consider thus: “There are also³ hungry ghosts in the realm of the dead, doers of evil deeds,⁴ who do not even in a hundred years obtain so much as a mere ball of phlegm to eat. Therefore, fixed in correct thoughts on the Teaching, I should not allow my body or my mind to be weakened, nor in any event should I think of hunger or thirst.⁵ I should not slacken my energy⁶ in my cultivation of the

good teachings. There are well-known gods, nāgas, and yakṣas who present him with food, because this is the result of yoga (or: because this is the result of being free of the yokes).” Concerning the rendering 離扼 for *yoga*, see the Introduction.

I do not understand the reference to “what was possessed by the gods.”

¹ Chinese adds: “or there is a great dust storm.”

² The Tibetan has rendered the Sanskrit quite literally: *maitry-āhāra-saṃnaddha*, as a genitive *tatpuruṣa*. The Sanskrit, Chinese of *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and the Chinese of the *Ratnarāśi* should perhaps be more reasonably understood as: “he girds himself with armor with friendliness as his food.” But I think the Tibetan simply cannot be read in that way.

³ That is, he thinks: in addition to me there are others even worse off.

⁴ The Chinese translations of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the *Ratnarāśi* understand this as “who because of their evil deeds” But Sanskrit and Tibetan take it appositionally.

⁵ Tibetan reads so, but Sanskrit and both Chinese versions understand “I will consent to (Chinese: endure) hunger and thirst.” Chinese has the whole expression as: “body and mind are exhausted, but I will now endure hunger and thirst.” The term for “consent” is *adhivāsayiṣyāmi*. The term *adhivāsanatā*, also found in Pāli, is defined by BHSD s.v. as endurance (of suffering) or toleration (of evil, etc.), with quotations of KP §114 and Bbh 288.26 (also Dutt 1978: 195.24-25), *kleśāsevādhivāsanatā*, which occurs in a list of five *hānabhāgīyā dharmā*. The Chinese there T. 1579 (XXX) 546b29 is 於諸煩惱親近執著, and Tibetan reads (Derge, Tōh. 4037, 151b4): *nyon mongs pa la sten pa dang du len pa*. These translations support the suggestion made by Prof. Nagao that something considerably more positive than endurance or toleration is going on here. Even “acquiescence” may be much too weak or neutral. “Consent,” which Edgerton offers as a separate meaning of the word, may be correct here as well. Note the reference in *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 215.23 to one of ten things to be renounced in the fifth bhūmi, *rāga dveṣa moha dhivāsanāḥ parivarjitavyāḥ*: “Acquiescence / consent to lust, hatred and delusion must be renounced.” For *adhivāsanā* in Pāli, see CPD s.v.

⁶ Chinese has “I should not backslide,” using the term usually reserved for *avaivartika* or

noble path.”

VI.10

The monk, Kāśyapa, who practices alms begging should not be intimate with families,¹ with men, with women, with boys or with girls. At a house at which he has [the donor] cleanse the [proffered] alms, he should sit on a seat and preach a discourse on the Teaching until they finish up cleansing the alms. Then taking those alms he should rise from his seat and go.

VI.11

The monk, Kāśyapa, who practices alms begging should not be a giver of hints, should not be boastful, should not be deceitful.² Here what is meant by “being a giver of hints”? Saying to others: “My alms are poor. My alms are coarse. Formerly I did not eat without so satiating myself.³ I shared my alms out among many people. I have eaten but little, and being unsatiated my body is weak.”

avaivartya. I doubt that this can be related other than conceptually (i.e., not verbally) to the *na sraṃsayiṣyāmi* of the Sanskrit text. The Chinese translation of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* appears to be corrupt at the end of this section.

¹ I have not been able to find a really appropriate English expression for the term I render “be intimate,” but the meaning is better conveyed by the slang term “chummy.” The monk should not frequent residences and be on familiar terms with its occupants. For “families,” Chinese has “lay people.”

² The reference is explicitly to two of the five *mithyājīva*, *kuhana* and *lapanā*, and by implication to a third, on which see Lamotte 1944-80: 1182-83. See CPD s.v. *obhāsa-kamma*, which quotes the *Vibhaṅgapakaraṇa* 353,1: *tattha katamā nemittikatā? lābhasakkārasilokasannissitassa pāpicchassa icchāpakatassa yaṃ paresaṃ nimittaṃ, nimittakammaṃ obhāso obhāsakammaṃ sāmantaajappā parikathā*. See also above I.4 (7), and note, for the term *lābhena lābhaniścikīrṣā*.

³ The Tibetan text, *bdag gis sngon 'di lta bu dang ma 'drangs par ma zos so*, does not seem to agree with the Sanskrit *na ca me yāvadārthaṃ bhuktaṃ*, “what I ate was not of necessity”? I am not sure, but is it possible that we should read **yāpanārtham*?

Whatever is thus characterized by hint giving is called mental deceit. The monk who follows the practice of alms begging should not do any of those things.¹

VI.12

Whatever comes into his begging bowl, whether poor, whether coarse, whether sparse, whether abundant, whether clean, whether unclean — he must eat it. He must eat alms in order to be without affliction, to purify his intention, to have ample profound concentration on the Teaching, to nourish his body, to maintain the path of the saints.

VI.13

If the monk, Kāśyapa, who undertakes alms begging practice begs for alms² in a village, town or city and does not obtain [any], if he returns with his begging bowl as it was when it was washed [clean and empty], he should think to himself: “Contemplating the Tathāgata, the Tathāgata shining bright by the splendor of his merit, who went forth [into the renunciant life] having abandoned the Universal Kingship, who is honored by gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas,³ who has

¹ Sanskrit adds: “being truly equanimous,” and the Chinese of the *Ratnarāṣi* has: “Kāśyapa. The alms begging monk should be equanimous with regard to all things.” Sanskrit has *upekṣakabhūtena*, which the Chinese translation of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* seems to have interpreted in a way beyond my comprehension: “Those monks who practice alms begging should be equanimous. What is true reality?” I think 棄捨 is intended for *upekṣā*, and 眞實 for *bhūta*, but how they came to be treated as parts of different sentences I cannot guess. Nakano 1935: 102 takes the question “What is true reality?” as leading into the next paragraph; this is probably the only way to read the Chinese (even though contextually it makes little sense), but it has in that case taken on a life of its own unrelated to the original text which it purports to be translating.

² Chinese adds: “in systematic order.”

³ Chinese omits “who is honored by gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas.”

abandoned all negative qualities, possessor of all positive qualities, free of all defilements¹ — if even he, when he went to a village for alms, came back with his begging bowl as it was when it was washed, what reason is there to be upset when one like me, of small merit, who has not produced roots of good, returns with begging bowl as it was when it was washed. Why? Because one who has not produced roots of good will not obtain good food.²

VI.14

If, whether through the action of Māra or through the supernatural power of Māra, those Brahmins and householders do not give alms to me,³ I should act so as to distance myself from the four Māras and become free from all defilements.”

Thus, Māra and the gods who are in league with Māra will not get the opportunity to harm one who dwells in the correct practice of my [Teaching]. Kāśyapa, the monk who undertakes alms begging practice must cultivate the saintly attitudes in that way.

The Chapter on Alms Begging Practice, The Sixth.

¹ Chinese omits “free of all defilements.”

² Chinese has the last sentence as: “(Therefore I should not be upset.) Why? Because not having planted roots of good, there is absolutely no way for me to obtain rough or fine food.”

Compare the passage in the “Twelve Dhūtagaṇa sūtra” 十二頭陀經, quoted in the Introduction. See also above, V.10.

³ Chinese has: “I might not obtain alms. Whether it is Māra himself or the servants of Māra, or Māra conceals the Brahmins and householders (from me?), making it such that I do not obtain alms....”

The English Translation: Chapter Seven

<Refuse Robes>

VII.1

Now, Kāśyapa, with what sort of mental attitude should the monk who wears refuse rags¹ collect refuse rags? With the mental attitude cloaked in modesty and bashfulness,² not with the mental attitude which strives with the effort to be adorned by robes.³ [He should collect them] in order to protect himself from being afflicted by the wind, sun, stinging insects, mosquitoes and snakes, not in order to ornament his body.⁴ Dwelling with correct practice in the preaching of the Tathāgata, he takes no delight in pure clothing.⁵ Taking refuse rags from the refuse heap, he should think of two ideas. Which two? The idea of contentment, and the idea that he is easily pleased.

¹ For a discussion of refuse rag robes and related matters, see the Introduction.

² **hrī* and **apatrāpya*.

³ Chinese has the sentence as: "Because of modesty and bashfulness, not in order to adorn himself."

⁴ Chinese omits "not in order to ornament his body."

The *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 (10) (I) 432b22-24 has the following: "Monks. If one uses a robe for clothing, it is not as a luxury, it is not as an ornament, but only because of mosquitoes, horseflies, wind, rain, cold and heat, and out of modesty and bashfulness." Basically the same at T. 31 (I) 813c18-20, and at *Ekottarāgama* T. 125 (34.9) (II) 741a1-4. The Pāli version of this is in the *Majjhima Nikāya* (MN i.10,5-8): "The monk, with correct and careful consideration, uses a robe, but only for protection from the cold, for protection from heat, for protection from contact with stinging insects, mosquitoes, wind, the heat of the sun, and serpents, or only in order to conceal the private parts." *bhikkhu paṭisankhā yoniso cīvaram paṭisevati yāvad eva sītassa paṭighātāya uñhassa paṭighātāya dāmsamakasavātātapasirimsapasamphassānam paṭighātāya yāvad eva hirikopīnapaṭicchādanattham*. This passage is commented upon in some detail in the *Visuddhimagga* I.85-88. In translating *hirikopīnapaṭicchādanattham* I follow the explanation in the *Visuddhimagga* (see Nyānamoli 1956: 32 = I.88). In the modern Sinhalese ordination ceremony reported by Dickson 1875: 7, the ordinand while changing into his monastic robes for the first time repeats the expression from the MN, changing only the verb into first person, namely *paṭisevāmi*. See also the passage from the *Ugradattapariprcchā* quoted in the notes to I.8, above.

⁵ Chinese has: "Because he is fixed in the teachings of the Buddha, not because he is seeking something pure and fine."

VII.2

He should, further, produce two [other] ideas. Which two? The idea of being without arrogance, and the idea of dwelling in the saintly attitudes.

VII.3

He should, further, produce two [other] ideas. Which two? [Not] adorning the body,¹ and purifying the mind.

VII.4

If the monk, Kāśyapa, who wears refuse rags, fearing disrepute to himself² when he is seen by those who were formerly his relatives and friends, or intimates, or acquaintances³ in that place when he is taking the refuse rags from the refuse heap, then does not take the refuse rags — Kāśyapa, I say that such refuse rags of a monk who wears refuse rags are not pure.⁴ Why? Because the monk who wears refuse rags should have an rock-like mind,⁵ and he should pick up refuse

¹ The Tibetan text must have dropped a negative here, found in Chinese and required by the sense. There is no trace of any negative, however, in any of the exemplars of the Tibetan version I have consulted.

² Chinese omits “fearing disrepute to himself.”

³ It seems that the implication may be that now that he is a monk such people are no longer to be considered as so related to him; he has broken his social ties with them.

⁴ Chinese has: “If the monk, Kāśyapa, who wears refuse rags is seen in that place at the time that he is picking up refuse on the refuse heap by his relatives or friends, and if being seen he stops picking up [refuse], thinking to himself ‘These people may slander me saying “You are not a pure person,”’ — Kāśyapa, I say that this monk is not able to practice purely.”

⁵ The reading “adamant-like mind” (**vajropamacitta*) of some Tibetan texts is a *lectio facilior*; “rock-like” is confirmed by Chinese. However, in the next clause Tibetan reads “adamant-like mind” with no variants in any exemplar I have seen. Chinese has the whole sentence as: “Why? Because the monk

rags being fearless because of his adamant-like mind.

VII.5

Picking up the refuse rags he shall wash them well and make them completely pure and stainless, and shall dye them, and shall patch together a monastic robe. Subsequently, he should wear it patching it well, mending it well, and sewing it up well such that it does not become ruined.¹

VII.6

The monk who wears refuse rags, Kāśyapa, should wear refuse rags upon his body fixed in mental contemplation on impurity in order to thoroughly pacify his lusts. He should wear refuse rags upon his body with a compassionate mental attitude in order to thoroughly pacify hatred. He should wear refuse rags upon his body fixed in [contemplation of] dependent co-origination in order to thoroughly pacify delusion. He should wear refuse rags upon his body with correct mental contemplation in order to remove all defilements.² He should wear refuse rags upon his body well constraining his senses in order to thoroughly know the six spheres. He should wear refuse rags upon his body without deception and without boasting in order to propitiate gods, nāgas, and yakṣas.

who wears refuse rags has a mind firm like a stone, so external things cannot enter it nor can they move it.” I do not know how to reconcile the two versions.

¹ Chinese instead of “such that ...” has “making sure that it does not come apart at the seams.”

² For these items see the classification in III.17, and the note there.

VII.7

Why, Kāśyapa, do people call them “refuse rags”? By way of example, Kāśyapa: refuse is a thing that has been thrown away on a refuse heap, no one desires it, no one wants it and no one picks it up.¹ In this way, Kāśyapa, [refuse rags] are similar to refuse in being without possessions, being without chattels, in being easily acquired, abundant,² in being unnecessary to request of others, in being unnecessary to regard the countenances of others, in not being subject to the control of others,³ and in being thrown away like refuse, and therefore people speak of them as “refuse rags.”

VII.8

This [refuse rag robe] is the lineage of the ṛṣis.⁴ This is the pure lineage of the saints. This is the fixity of the saintly attitudes. This is the refuge of the dhuta ascetic purification practices. This is the guard of all constituent elements of morality. This is the door of the constituent elements of meditative concentration. This is the basis of the constituent elements of knowledge. This is the arisal of

¹ Chinese has: “Kāśyapa, just as no one desires a corpse and no one has the idea that it is their property, the rule is that it should be abandoned. So too, Kāśyapa refuse rag robes”

² I am not clear on the difference between *rnyed sla ba* and *mod pa*. Both would seem to be possible translations of *sulabha* (Mhy. 2656, Tse ring dbang rgyal [Bacot 1930: 131b]). In the LSV, however, *mod pa* is cited as *sphīta* (Inagaki 1984: 93). Another problem is the Chinese equivalent of *mod pa*, which seems to be 非邪命, “not [through] wrong livelihood,” **amithyājīvena* or **na mithyājīvena*. I cannot now make any suggestion which might lead to a possible connection between the Tibetan and Chinese readings.

³ These expressions are not clear to me. The last seems to refer to *aparādhīna* (Mhy. 2397), but the same Sanskrit is offered for the previous term, *gzhan ngor*, in Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 151a). The equivalent of these three items in Chinese is: “not seeking / requesting them from others, not examining the countenances of others (?)” The latter expression 不觀他顏色 seems to be almost literally equivalent to Tibetan *gzhan gyi ngor blta mi dgos pa*, but the meaning of both is not quite clear to me.

⁴ Chinese for “lineage of the ṛṣis” has here “dharma-banner” 法幢, a term which in the LSV (Inagaki 1984: 34) refers to *dharmadhvaja*.

the constituent elements of liberation. This is in harmony with the agglomeration of the knowledge and vision of liberation.¹ In this way, Kāśyapa, [the monk] who wears refuse rags is full of good qualities, without occasion, without opportunity, lives in the open air,² is stainless,³ and has laid down the burden.⁴

VII.9

Even the gods, Kāśyapa, will be delighted by⁵ a refuse rag wearing monk who is satisfied with robes of refuse rags. Such things do occur,⁶ Kāśyapa, and, thus, if even Śakra, Brahmā and the World-Protectors joining their hands in reverent salute fall at his feet and do homage to a refuse rag wearing monk who wears poor quality robes and who has attained the bliss of Concentration, it goes without saying that the other gods⁷ will do homage to him.

¹ We have, again, the set of *śīla-skandhaḥ*, *samādhi°*, *prajñā°*, *vimukti°*, and *vimuktijñānadarsana°*. The Chinese has the paragraph up to here as follows: "Rag robes [of the monk who wears rag robes] are his dharma banner, because he is a great ṛṣi; they are his gotra because he is an ārya; they are his fixed dwelling because of his saintly attitudes (**āryavamsā*); they are his single-mindedness because he follows good behaviors and conduct (**[sam]ācāra*); they are his protection because of the aggregate of morality; they are his door because of the aggregate of concentration; they are his fixed dwelling because of the aggregate of wisdom; they are his body because of the aggregate of liberation; they are his harmony with the teaching because of the aggregate of knowledge and vision of liberation."

² I do not understand the first two of these three expressions, but it seems clear that there is some sort of verbal play here; I believe the three terms, *skabs med pa*, *go skabs med pa* and *bla gab med pa* may be equivalent to **nirākāśa*, **anavakāśa*, and **ābhyavakāśika*. See *Bodhicaryāvatāra* IX.95b (Weller's index misprinted as IX.94b) Mhy. 6440, 1136. Chinese has apparently only two terms, "desiring nothing, lusting after nothing." I do not know how to resolve the problem at present.

³ We have here another interesting case of a misunderstanding by the Chinese translators. The Sanskrit text evidently had **nirmala*, but Chinese 能離慢心, "free from arrogance," suggests that they read instead **nirmāna*.

⁴ **apahṛtabhāra*, for which see BHSD s.v. The Tibetan translation here, *khur khyer bar 'gyur ba*, is non-standard; the usual rendering (Mhy. 1084) is *khur bor ba*.

⁵ Chinese: "delighted to see."

⁶ *'di lta bu'i dus dang / 'di lta bu'i man yod de*. I do not understand the expression. Compare Pāli *okāsa*? There is no equivalent in Chinese. The same occurs again in VII.16.

⁷ Chinese: "minor gods."

VII.10

Monks¹ who make an effort, Kāśyapa, to adorn themselves with the monastic robes, but who do not exert themselves in yoga, for whom the quintessential thing is the ornamentation of the body, who are given to practices of external purity but who inwardly are full of lust, hatred and delusion — no matter how good the quality of the robes they wear, Kāśyapa, their form does not please the gods.² Why? The gods know the thoughts and mental factors of those who exert themselves with the intention of adorning the body, and knowing that they keep them far away and spurn them.³

VII.11

Kāśyapa.⁴ The novice Cunda after picking up refuse rags polluted by impurity went begging for alms and went to lake Anavatapta.⁵ When he got there the gods who dwell at that excellent lake came forth from a great distance to meet

¹ Chinese: “evil monks.”

² We may compare the expression in Thag 1080-81 (translation Norman 1969): “A conceited and vain bhikkhu, clad in a rag from a dust-heap, does not seem impressive because of it, like a monkey in a lion-skin. One who is not conceited, not vain, zealous, with faculties restrained, does appear impressive because of his rag from a dust-heap, like a lion in a mountain cave.” *uddhato capalo bhikkhu paṃsukūlena pāruto / kapi va sīhacammena na so tenupasobhati // anuddhato acapalo nipako saṃvutindriyo / sobhati paṃsukūlena sīho va girigabbhare //*

³ Chinese has: “... adorn their bodies with the monastic robes, who are given to practices of external purity, but who inwardly are full of lust, hatred, and delusion, although they adorn their bodies in this way, the gods, nāgas and yakṣas do not honor and worship them. Why? [The gods] know that these monks make an effort to adorn their bodies with the robes, not to remove the obstructions of mind and thoughts. Because the gods know that, they spurn them far away.”

⁴ Chinese adds: “you saw that”

⁵ Chinese adds: “desiring to wash off [the rags].” There are nearly identical versions of this story in several other Buddhist texts. See the Introduction for a detailed discussion.

him, and paying homage to him by bowing their heads at his feet those gods of pure behavior¹ themselves washed the refuse rags polluted by impurity, and having made them stainless anointed their own bodies with that dirty washing water. Knowing Cunda to have undertaken and attained the virtues of the precepts, the gods of that lake paid homage to him with the five pointed prostration.

VII.12

Observe: The renunciant² named Subhadra, after putting on pure robes, having begged for alms went to lake Anavatapta. And it occurred to the gods who dwell at that lake, "After eating his food here at this excellent lake, when he leaves behind the remains he will make the excellent lake impure," and they did not permit him to approach to within so much as a perimeter of one *krośa* [around the lake].³

VII.13

You must observe, Kāśyapa, the superiority of his accomplishment of the good

¹ Mhy. 6369, *cauḥsasamudācāra*. The term appears in Aṣṭa (Mitra 89 = Wogihara 260.6-7 and Mitra 326 = Wogihara 671.12), but in neither place does it apply to gods. It is defined by Haribhadra in the first location as "of pure behavior because internally pure of all causes of evil," *sarvāpāpākaraṇād adhyātmasuddhyā cauḥsasamudācārah*.

² Chinese calls him a **brahmacārin* rather than a **parivrājaka*, as Tibetan has it.

³ Chinese: "They stopped him far away, five *li* from each of the four sides of the lake, and did not permit him to draw close to the lake, fearing his impure food and leftovers would defile the great lake."

AK 87d and AKB ad (Pradhan 1975:177.5; La Vallée Poussin 1923-31: iii.179 with note 2) note that an *araṇya* should be one *krośa* from a village. La Vallée Poussin notes: "Eitel (p. 98) observes that the cemetery ascetic may not approach a village closer than the limit of a *krośa*." I am not sure to what work La Vallée Poussin is referring.

qualities of the noble Teaching,¹ and the gods sprinkling on their own bodies the dirty water with which Cunda's refuse rags were washed, and their not permitting the renunciant Subhadra even to go [to the lake].²

VII.14

"Therefore, Kāśyapa, the refuse rag wearing monk who desires such virtuous qualities as these,³ who is not timid and shrinking,⁴ who dwells in the saintly attitudes, should wear refuse rags upon his body with the idea that they are a shrine, the idea that they are the teacher, and the idea that they are unselfish and without any chattels."⁵

VII.15

"Once again, the body becomes purified through the mind, but the mind does not become purified through the body. Therefore, although one should purify the mind, it is not purified by adorning the body. Since the purification of the mind is spoken of in the teachings of the blessed one as the practice of purity, one should

¹ Chinese has: "because he correctly practices virtuous acts the noble attains this fruit." Tibetan seems to represent something like **āryadharmaguṇasamādānaviṣeṣa*.

² Chinese has "to go within five *li* of the lake," and adds the following: "Kāśyapa. Who, having heard this, would not make an effort to train themselves in the noble teaching? Those nobles and those heavenly beings all will come bowing their heads to him in worship and honor."

³ Chinese: "one who wears the refuse rag robe because he desires such virtuous qualities as these."

⁴ See the note to III.4. Here Chinese has, apparently corresponding, "should not be upset."

⁵ For part of this formulation see the list in I.8, above, in which eight types of respect toward the robe are listed. Only two of the eight, the idea that the robes are a shrine and the idea that they are the teacher, correspond to the present enumeration. Chinese adds after "teacher" "the idea that they are supramundane (**lokottara*)."⁵ At the end of the section Chinese adds: "Having contemplated in such a way, the wearer of refuse rag robes should profoundly concentrate his mind in that way."

profoundly meditate on the mind.¹

VII.16

“Therefore, Kāśyapa, the refuse rag wearing monk should imitate² you and me. Kāśyapa, such things do occur. You, Kāśyapa, wear a poor robe and are satisfied with your robe no matter how poor.³ At the time when you are promenading on the promenade walk,⁴ having set down your outer cloak on a seat or on the top of a seat, and wearing your upper robe, many hundreds of thousands of gods will gather there and say: ‘This is an upper robe worn on a body perfumed by the precepts, concentration and wisdom,’⁵ and they will pay homage to that upper robe of yours. Observe, Kāśyapa! If they will pay homage even to [your] monastic robe, how much more so [will they pay homage] to your body!”

VII.17

Kāśyapa. I think that as monks imitate me so they shall succeed.⁶ Giving up the

¹ That is, the purification of the mind is equivalent to the practice of purity, *brahmacarya*.

² **anuśikṣitavyam*.

³ Chinese: “Kāśyapa. If you can gather such poor robes, then you will be satisfied by practicing the saintly attitudes.” The term which at Mhy. 2216 is (*na*) *itaretareṇa saṃtuṣṭiḥ* = *ngan ngon gyis chog* (*mi*) *shes pa* is close to the Tibetan here, *ngan ngon gyis chog par 'dzin pa*. But *ngan ngon* is also equivalent to *avaraka* or *avavara* (see Mhy. 2701, Tse ring dbang rgyal [Bacot 1930: 40a]), “humble, poor.” On the other hand, the term translated by the Chinese text is almost certainly that found in Mhy. 2371 *āryavaṃśa-saṃtuṣṭa*. I cannot suggest how these two expressions could be ultimately connected.

⁴ See BHSD s.v. *caṅkrama* (cognate construction). The promenade is a walkway for walking meditation. Such promenades are a prominent feature of contemporary Buddhist hermitages.

⁵ The reference is to the triad *śīla*, *saṃādhi* and *prajñā*. Compare the expression in the *Suvārṇa-bhāṣottama* (Sanskrit 206.6 = Tibetan 156.6-7) *śīlaguṇaparivāsita* = *tshul khrims dang yon tan gyis yongsu b(s)gos pa*.

⁶ This sentence is not found in Chinese.

sovereignty of the Universal Emperor I renounced the household life, and rejecting monastic robes made of fine Benares cloth, of Dukūla cotton, of Koṭambaka cotton and of goose-patterned cloth,¹ I wear robes of hempen cotton upon my body because I delight in the saintly attitudes.²

VII.18

I took from you, Kāśyapa, a fine³ silk garment and I gave to you one of hempen

¹ Mhy 9176 *kāśikasūkṣma*, 9162 *dukūlaka*, 9163 *koṭambaka*. See G. Roth 1970: 124, §149 verse 11ab *kadāhaṃ kāśikaṃ vastraṃ kṣaumaḥ koṭumbakāni ca* /. Page 179 §181 note 1 refers to *haṃsalakṣaṇa-paṭa*, and says “this term is frequently met with in the Jaina Siddhānta.” Roth quotes *Kādambarī* 98.6 in which “*dukūla* garments are described as *haṃsasita*.” Roth also refers to *Nāyādhammakahāo* XVI.117 (our 273.4-5) which reads *haṃsalakṣaṇaṃ paṭagaśādagāṃ parihenti*. Roth translates “They put round him [the beggar] a garment made of cloth, having the characteristics [of the feathers] of a goose [i.e. of a very fine and soft quality].” In the same text see also 50.15, 51.4, 55.18, 113.1. BHSD s.v. *kaṭumba-* refers to Divy 559.10, to which Nolot 1991: 112, note 93 adds a reference to the *Bhikṣunikarmavacana* (Ridding & La Vallée Poussin) p. 136.5 [folio 22b4-5] which has *kāśisūkṣmaṃ vā ... dukūlakasūkṣmaṃ vā koṭambaka-sūkṣmaṃ vā*. SP 89.6 has *koṭambakahaṃsalakṣaṇa*. For *haṃsalakṣaṇa* see BHSD s.v. The word also occurs in the *Vasudevahimṇī*, see Jamkhedkar 1984: 179-80, note 967, and on *dukūla* 129-30, note 919. See also Chandra 1973: 56 and 115 on *dukūla*, 11 on *koṭumbaka*, 157 #45 and 168 #6 on *haṃsavādī*, and also his plates after page 179, figure 15. What may be an image of the “goose patterned cloth” is found in Ajanta on the wall of the left corridor of cave 1, *Mahājanaka Jātaka*, illustrated in Takata 1971, plate 86.

² Instead of “because I delight in the saintly attitudes,” Chinese has: “(Having given up all those robes) I now am satisfied practicing the saintly attitudes. For the sake of others I get rid of fine clothes in favor of those gathered in cemeteries.”

³ Actually we have a serious problem here. The Tibetan unequivocally reads not “fine” but rather exactly the opposite, “poor,” *ngan pa*. Chinese has “upper robe of golden thread,” 金縷上衣. I have emended the Tibetan text, believing that the reading of all versions, *ngan*, should in fact be *ngang*, since the term *ngang pa* may mean exactly red-yellow color, completely agreeing with the Chinese. (*ngang pa* usually renders *haṃsa*, as it does in VII.17. When it means red-yellow color, I do not know to what Sanskrit term it corresponds. It is also possible, I suppose, that the reference is to the *haṃsa* cloth mentioned in VII.17, above.)

If this is not the correct solution, however, it is also possible that the confusion can be explained by hypothesizing the presence of the term *dūṣya*, for which see the detailed discussion in BHSD s.v. 2 *duṣya*. This term, often compounded with a following *-paṭa*, is regularly rendered in Tibetan as *ras bcos bu*. (In the *Ratnaketu* 95.6, 100.10, 14, however, the Dunhuang text has *god 'du sha* instead.) But when we observe that *duṣṭha* has the meaning of spoiled, bad, corrupt, it becomes conceivable to suggest that somehow the intended reading *dūṣya* was understood, either through graphic confusion or otherwise, as *duṣṭha*. The latter could quite correctly be rendered into Tibetan with *ngan pa*.

cotton.¹ This is all because of my compassion directed toward you, not because of my desire and not in order to ornament my body.

VII.19

In this regard, Kāśyapa, some deluded people do not imitate you and me; they are overcome by greed and longing, hoard monastic robes, hoard begging bowls, hoard worldly material possessions, hoard cowries and gold and jewels and grain, amass cows, sheep, chickens, swine, donkeys, horses, and [animals] to draw ploughs and carts,² and they are fully devoted to carrying out the householder's activities. Householders have something special, Kāśyapa, but those foolish men, even though they have crossed the boundary into renunciation, have nothing that is special.³

VII.20

Kāśyapa. Why are householders special?⁴ Householders know that those who are not śramaṇas but falsely claim to be śramaṇas, who are not followers of the practice of purity but falsely claim to be followers of the practice of purity, who wear the monastic robes while busy with affairs, who are polluted by various

¹ The reference here is to a story recounted in the *Samyuktāgama* T. 99 (1144) (II) 303a28-b29 = T. 100 (II) 418b4-c14 ≈ SN ii.219,31-221,21. See Lamotte 1944-80: 1399, with note 1. I have translated the first Chinese version in the Introduction, and discussed the entire episode.

² Such lists, with considerable flexibility in their exact wording, are standard stereotyped expressions for wealth, and are found throughout Buddhist literature.

³ Chinese has: "Kāśyapa, there are wise people who although they dwell in the home are able to increase their good dharmas. Fools [even if they] renounce the home are not able to obtain such a good portion."

⁴ Literally: "As for what makes the householder special:"

pollutions, and who are intent on seeking food and clothes, [nevertheless] wear the monastic robe, and so they respect and honor them, greet them with robes and alms, speak respectfully to them, and rise to pay homage to them. This is what makes those householders special, Kāśyapa, but those renunciants do not possess those [qualities]. Why? Because they are not zealous in practicing [special distinctions], much less do they accumulate them.¹

VII.21

At that time,² Kāśyapa, monks generally will have many begging bowls and robes, many vessels and many possessions, and they will be honored, respected, and revered and worshipped. Why? Because receiving gifts and giving them back from time to time, so I may obtain some in just that way.³

VII.22

Those monks who uphold the precepts, possess good qualities, apply themselves to the destruction of the depravities, are disgusted with the world, full of zeal as if their head and clothes were on fire,⁴ with few goals and few things to do,⁵

¹ Chinese has the passage as follows: "How can the wise householder increase his good qualities? Kāśyapa, there may be a renunciant who wears the monastic robes but who is not a śramaṇa, who is very busy with affairs, very involved in seeking good clothing and food. After he puts on his monastic robe a householder may see him and respectfully pay homage to him, and come to greet him offering robes, food, bedding and medicaments. Kāśyapa, householders have such good qualities, but those renunciants do not. Why? Because those renunciants seek many things, but are not able to give them to others."

² Chinese has, more logically, "In the future there will be monks"

³ Chinese has here: "Why? That is, monks receive many of gifts, and might give some to me. If I wait, I will be able to get them from time to time." I am not sure I have understood the Tibetan correctly.

⁴ For "possess good qualities, apply themselves to the destruction of the depravities, are disgusted with the world, full of zeal as if their head and clothes were on fire," Chinese has: "see the faults and evils

intent on their own benefit, who have completely abandoned friendships¹ — no one at that time will go toward them, no one will be close to them or pay them honor. Why? Because householders, being of lustful nature and intent on the present but not intent on future births, think thus: “If those monks do not provide a livelihood for us, why should we be close to them, bow to them, honor them, respect them?” Nevertheless, there are a few exceptions who have planted good roots, who accomplishing the effort of previous lives² will uphold the precepts, who will be close to those who possess such good qualities, and who will honor them and respect them

VII.23

Such teachings as these, Kāśyapa, with such an approach, please two kinds of people. Which two? (1) Those who, seeing the truth, look upon saṃsāra with fear, and (2) those who, applying themselves to the practice of yoga, wish to obtain the fruit [of the śramaṇa], believe in the maturation of acts, and striving for the Teaching desire the Teaching.³

of the world, make an effort to cultivate good dharmas and get rid of all depravities, as if their heads were on fire.”

⁵ *alpārtha and *alpakaraṇīya. Chinese has: “Their minds will be satisfied, their conditions (? 緣事) few.” I do not really know how to read the last expression, but it seems possible that *alpakaraṇīya* may have been read as *alpa-karaṇa.

¹ I have some reservations about this rendering of *'dris par byed pa yongs su spangs pa*. BHSD s.v. *parijaya* discusses the term, which Edgerton renders “intensive cultivation, thorough acquaintance, familiarity, careful consideration.” Chinese: “who are free from cultivation of evil relations (?)”

² *pūrvayogasampanna.

³ Chinese has: “1) One who sees the four noble truths. 2) One who sees the faults and evils of saṃsāra. Another two. 1) One who endeavors to get rid of the four yokes. 2) One who desires to obtain the fruit of the śramaṇa. Another two. 1) One who single-mindedly contemplates the maturation of acts. 2) One who wants to know the meaning of the teachings.” Probably the text had some form of **dharmārtha*, and the Chinese and Tibetan translators respectively understood *artha* as “meaning” and “for the sake of.”

VII.24

I will shut¹ the doors, Kāśyapa, of all those who do not apply themselves, who look toward what is improper,² who contradict the [fact of] the maturation of acts, who are not fearful of censure in the other world, who exert themselves for the present, who do not exert themselves for the future.³

VII.25

I did not create an opportunity in such a teaching as this, Kāśyapa, for those deluded people who do not produce even so much as one thought imbued with liberation. But nevertheless, when they hear such teachings they understand that they have offended against what I established, and they think to slander it saying:⁴ “These are not what was spoken by the Buddha, but rather they are one’s own personal fabrications, or created by Māra to cause havoc.”⁵ And they will

See KP §156 *dharmārthikatā* and §10v, 15 *dharmakāma*.

¹ Chinese 閉, Tibetan *bshad*, present of *'chad pa* (Zhang et al. 1985: 3160). Jäschke (1881 s.v. *sgo*) refers to the expression *sgo gcod pa*, to shut or lock a door. *gcod pa*, he explains s.v. *'chad pa*, as the transitive form of *'chad pa*.

² Or, “who hold an improper view”?

³ Chinese: “Kāśyapa. I will now shut the doors of all those who are lazy (*kausīdya*), that is: who do not know the fact of action and the maturation of acts, who do not practice good dharmas, who do not see the fault in the other world, for instance like a vajra (see Introduction for this expression), who see the benefit in the present but do not see the benefits in the next world, who do not single-mindedly devote themselves to the gates of liberation.” The final clause is connected in the Tibetan version with the following section VII.25.

⁴ Chinese has rather: “Kāśyapa. I now explain that those evil monks will not desire such a preaching in accord with the teaching or such an opportunity in accord with the teaching. Hearing such teachings, they themselves know what they have practiced, but they do not comprehend the profound teaching and slander it saying”

⁵ Chinese: “they are made up by scholars (? 論師), or preached by Māra.” The rendering “to cause havoc” is slightly free, but undoubtedly we have to do with the term **viheṭhanā* ([*rnam par*] *tho 'tsham[s] pa*). See Hirakawa 1973 s.v., Bacot 1930: 73b.

thus mislead many beings. They themselves will be ruined and they will also bring ruin upon others; they themselves will be defiled and they will defile others. And thus, those deluded people are not engaged for the benefit of themselves or for the benefit of others.¹

VII.26

Then the Reverend Mahākāśyapa spoke thus to the Blessed One: “Blessed One. Here in this discourse on doctrine, the *Collection of Jewels*,² the Blessed One, Tathāgata, Arhat, Complete and Perfect Buddha, expansively preached the great compassion of the Buddhas, Blessed Ones, to those persons for whom practice is quintessential,³ for whom the teaching is their Lord.⁴ Blessed One, those beings who, upon hearing this discourse on doctrine, have conviction and perfect⁵ [the teaching] in accord with reality are protectively embraced⁶ by the Buddha.

VII.27

This is a clear instance of a phenomenon common in Mahāyāna literature, namely the “demonization” of teachings with which the author(s) of a given text might not agree. The approach is, in a sense, an extreme variant on the ad hominem argument: “not only is that text / doctrine etc. wrong, it is an expression produced by the embodiment of pure evil, Māra.” For a start at a sociological critique of the issue, see Kent 1982: 318-19, and the remarks of McQueen 1981: 304.

¹ Chinese: “These evil monks cannot benefit themselves nor [can] they benefit others.”

² **Ratnakūṭadharmaparyāya*.

³ **pratipattisāra*. This term is found in KP §2. Chinese has it that they are monks.

⁴ **dharmēśvara*. The Chinese translation, 於諸法中得自在者, would be difficult to understand without a comparison with the Tibetan.

⁵ Chinese: “read and recite.”

⁶ **pariṅgrah*.

The Blessed One said: “It is so, Kāśyapa, it is so. Those beings who, upon hearing this discourse on doctrine, have faith and perfect [the teaching] in accord with reality are embraced by the Buddha.”¹

VII.28

Then the Blessed One spoke to the Reverend Ānanda: “Ānanda. You must uphold this chapter of the teaching for the sake of those gentle sons or gentle daughters who have produced roots of good, desire peace, and desire liberation. And those householders and renunciants will also study this teaching and then will eliminate all the attachments to existence and will obtain nirvāṇa.”²

VII.29

[Ānanda] said: “Blessed One. When I uphold this discourse on doctrine, Blessed One, what shall be the name of this discourse on doctrine, how shall I uphold it?”

¹ There is no equivalent for this section in the Chinese translation.

² Chinese has: “At that time the Buddha said to Ānanda: If there are those —namely, gentle sons or gentle daughters— who accept and uphold this sūtra, because they have already planted roots of good under previous buddhas, they now wish to obtain this sūtra, read and recite it, and understand its merits, and [so] they desire to obtain liberation. Whether they study it as renunciants or study it as householders, this teaching can cut off their depravities and enable them to obtain nirvāṇa.”

There are two possible ways to understand the syntax of the Tibetan in the last expression: “they will eliminate all the attachments / bonds to existence and obtain nirvāṇa,” or: “they will obtain the nirvāṇa which is free of all attachments to existence.” The latter would then refer to something like **anutpadhiṣeṣa-nirvāṇa*. The Chinese seems to have translated the first alternative, with the difference that for *phung po* = *skandha* / *upadhi* it has *āsrava*. At LV (Sanskrit 31.21 = Tibetan 33.18) *sarvopadhipratiniḥsargāyaiḥ samvartate* = *rdzas thams cad rab tu spong bar 'gyur ro*. Mhy. 2549 *sarvopadhipratinisarga* = *phung po kun spangs pa*. Given the Chinese understanding and the expressions quoted from LV and Mhy. I have followed this interpretation in my translation.

VII.30

The Blessed One said: "Ānanda. Therefore you shall uphold this discourse on doctrine as "The Compendium of all Teachings,"¹ or "Dwelling in the Noble Behaviors and Ascetic Practices,"² or "Protectively Embracing those who Uphold the Precepts,"³ or "Censure of Precept Breakers,"⁴ or "Collection of Jewels,"⁵ or "Heap of Jewels,"⁶ or "Hoard of Jewels," or "The Chapter of the Jeweled Dharma-Gate."⁷

VII.31

When the Blessed One had spoken thus, the Reverend Mahākāśyapa, the Reverend Ānanda, and the world with its gods, men, asuras and gandharvas rejoiced and praised what was spoken by the Blessed One.

-
- 1 **Sarvadharmasamuccaya.*
 2 **Āryavaṃśadhūtaguṇa.*
 3 **Śīlavatparigraha.*
 4 **Duḥśīlāvasādana.*
 5 **Ratnakūṭa.*
 6 **Ratnarāśi.*
 7 **Ratnadharma-mukha / -dvāra.*

THE ORIGINS AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE *MAHĀRATNAKŪṬA*
TRADITION OF MAHĀYĀNA BUDDHISM
WITH A STUDY OF THE *RATNARĀSISŪTRA* AND RELATED MATERIALS

Volume II

by

Jonathan Alan Silk

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Asian Languages and Cultures: Buddhist Studies)
in The University of Michigan
1994

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Luis Oscar Gómez, Chair
Professor Madhav M. Deshpande
Assistant Professor T. Griffith Foulk
Professor Donald Lopez
Professor Gregory Schopen, The University of Texas

SECTION III

The following abbreviations of text editions are used in the edition:

- A: The Tabo Kanjur.
- B: Berlin Manuscript Kanjur.
- C: Cone Kanjur.
- D: Derge Kanjur.
- F: Phug brag Manuscript Kanjur.
- J: 'Jang sa tham / Lithang Kanjur.
- L: London Manuscript Kanjur.
- M: Tōyō Bunko Manuscript Kanjur.
- N: Narthang Kanjur.
- P: Peking Kanjur.
- S: sTog Palace Manuscript Kanjur.
- Śikṣ: *Śikṣāsamuccaya*

The Tibetan Text: Chapter One

I.0 B 150a1, C161a3, D152a1, F202a6, J 164b6, L168a3, M207b1, N 261a2, P146b5, S249a1:

ལྷོ་མ་ // 'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa^b chen po'i^c chos kyi nram grangs le'u stong
phrag brgya pa las^d le'u bzhi bcu rtsa bzhi pa ste / 'phags pa rin po che'i phung po lung
bstan pa /¹ bam po dang po /²

3 ལྷོ་མ་ //⁴ rgya gar skad du / ārya⁵ rad na⁶ rā⁷ shi⁸ nā⁹ ma ma hā^e yā¹⁰ na sū¹¹ tra /¹²

Kanjur text

bod skad du^f / 'phags pa^g rin po che'i^h
phung po zhes bya ba¹³ theg pa chen po'i
mdoⁱ //¹⁴

Dunhuang manuscripts

X // 'phags¹ pa rin² po che phung po'i³
mdo⁴ bam po dang po'o⁵ //

1) Dh1 (Stein 165), Dh2 (Stein 166): begin here.
Dh2: +phags. 2) Dh1: rin. 3) Dh1: po'i. Dh2:
po+i. 4) Dh1 inserts btus pa. 5) Dh2: po+o.

sangs rgyas dang¹⁵ byang chub sems
dpa' thams cad^k la phyag 'tshal lo¹⁶ //

sangs rgyas dang¹ byang chub sems
dpa'² thams cad la phyag³ 'tshal⁴ lo //
1) Dh1: inserts /. 2) Dh2: dpa+. 3) Dh1 missing
cad la phyag because the side of the leaf is torn. 4)
Dh2: +tshal.

I.1

B 150a2, C161a5, D152a2, F202a7, J 164b8,
L168a6, M207b2, N 261a3, P146b6, S249a2:

Dunhuang manuscripts

- 1 C, J: // for /. L: reads ... phung po'o //, omitting lung bstan pa.
- 2 C, J, L: // for /.
- 3 B, F, M, N, P, S: start here.
- 4 D, J: omit ལྷོ་མ་ // . L: omits ལྷོ་མ་ .
- 5 C, M, P ā rya for ārya. B, F: arya for ārya.
- 6 M: rat na for rad na. S: ratna for rad na. N: inserts pa.
- 7 B, F: ra for rā.
- 8 M, S: shī for shi.
- 9 D, F: na for nā.
- 10 B, C, F, N: ya for yā.
- 11 F, L, P: su for sū. CHECK B N: stu for sū?
- 12 B, P: // for /.
- 13 B, P: insert /.
- 14 C, D, J: / for //. M, N, S: add bam po dang po / [M], // [N, S].
- 15 D, J: insert /.
- 16 L, M, N: 'tshalo.

'di skad bdag gis thos pa dus gcig na /
 bcom ldan 'das rgyal po'i^a khab na /¹ bya
 rgod kyib^b phung po'i ri la /^c dge slong
 brgyad stong tsam^d gyi^e dge slong gi^f
 dge 'dun chen po dang / sangs rgyas^g kyi
 zhing sna tshogs nas 'dus^h pa'i byang
 chub sems dpa' khri drug stong dang²
 thabs gcigⁱ tu³ bzhugs te /^j thams cad
 kyang 'di lta ste /^k bla na med pa yang
 dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu⁴ skye
 ba gcig gis thogs pa^l phyir mi ldog^m pa'i
 bzod pa thob pa⁵ sha stag goⁿ /^o

'di¹ skad bdag gis² thos pa'i³ dus gcig⁴
 na /⁵ bcom ldan 'das⁶ rgyal po'i⁷ khab /
 bya rgod phung po+i⁸ ri⁹ la //¹⁰ dge
 slong gi¹¹ dge¹² +dun¹³ chen po brgyad
 stong dang¹⁴ /¹⁵ byang¹⁶ chub sems
 dpa¹⁷ sems dpa+i¹⁸ chen po khri¹⁹ drug
 stong dang thabs²⁰ gcig²¹ du bzhugs te
 /²² thams²³ cad kyang bla na myed²⁴ pa
 yang dag par rdzogs pa+i²⁵ byang chub
 las phyir myi²⁶ ltog pa+i²⁷ skye ba gcig
 gyi²⁸ rgyal +tshab²⁹ du dbang bskur³⁰
 bar +gyur pa /³¹ phyogs bcu+i sangs³²
 rgyas gyi zhing³³ tha dad pa³⁴ nas +dus
 par³⁵ gyur pa³⁶ sha stag go //

- 1) Dh1: 'di for 'di. 2) Dh1: gis for gis. Dh2: gyis for gis. 3) Dh1: pa'+i; Dh2: pa+i. 4) Dh1: gcig for gcig. 5) Dh1: // for /. 6) Dh2: +das for 'das. 7) Dh1: po+i. 8) Dh1: po+i. 9) Dh1: ri. 10) Dh1: omits //. 11) Dh2: gyi. 12) Dh1: manuscript torn, and slong gi dge is missing. 13) Dh1: + missing because torn off. 14) Dh2: written small — added afterwards? 15) Dh1: // for /. 16) Dh2: bya for byang. 17) Dh1: dpa+. Dh2: sems dpa' written below line in small hand. 18) Dh1: pa for dpa+. 19) Dh1: khri. 20) Dh2: thams. 21) Dh1: gcig. 22) Dh2: / below the line written small. 23) Dh2: thams written below the line small. 24) Dh1 damaged at the beginning of the line; the previous line ended with thams, and the first word here is (my)[e]d. 25) Dh1: pa+i. 26) Dh1: phyir myi for phyir myi. 27) Dh1: pa / for pa+i. 28) Dh1: gcig gi for gcig gyi. 29) Dh2 adds + below line. 30) Dh1: bskurr for bskur. 31) Dh1: ba // for pa /. 32) Dh1 damaged and missing phyogs bcu+i sa.... 33) Dh1: kyī zhing for gyi zhing. 34) Dh1: ba for pa. 35) Dh1: bar for par. 36) Dh1: ba.

I.2

- 1 C, D, J, L, N: omit /.
 2 M, S: add yang.
 3 B, P: du for tu.
 4 B, P: du for tu.
 5 M, S: dang ldan ba for thob pa.

B 150a4, C161a7, D152a3, F202b2, J 165a2,
L168a7, M207b4, N 261a6, P146b8, S249a5:
de nas^a bcom ldan 'das la¹ tshe dang ldan
pa^b 'od srung^c chen pos 'di skad ces gsol
to // bcom ldan 'das dge sbyong dge
sbyong zhes bgyi ba^d ji tsam gyis na^e
dge sbyong dge sbyong² zhes bgyi ba
lags /³ de skad ces gsol pa dang /^f bcom
ldan 'das kyis⁴ tshe dang ldan pa 'od
srung^g chen po^h la 'di skad ces bka' stsal
to // 'od srung dge sbyong dge sbyong
zhes bya ba ni⁵ⁱ

- 1) zhi ba dang /j
- 2) dul ba dang /k
- 3) cang shes pa¹ dang /
- 4) tshul khirms kyi phung po
yongs su⁶ dag pa dang /
- 5) ting nge⁷ 'dzin la⁸ 'jug pa
shes pas

dge sbyong zhes bya^m ste /⁹

- 6) shes rab dang ldan pa dangⁿ
/
- 7) mam^o par^p grol ba'i¹⁰ snying
po lhur len pa dang /

Dunhuang manuscripts:

de nas bcom ldan 'das¹ la tshe dang ldan
pa² 'od³ srung⁴ chen pos 'di⁵ skad⁶ ces
gsol to // bcom ldan 'das dge sbyong
zhes bgyi ba⁷ ci tsam gyis na dge sbyong
dge sbyong zhes pgyi lags // bcom ldan
'das kyis bka' stsal pa / 'od srungs dge
sbyong / zhes⁸ bya ba ni /

nye bar zhi bar gyur pa+i phyir dang /
rab tu dul bar gyur pa+i phyir dang /
bka+ nyan pa+i phyir [*dang*] /
tshul khirms kyi phung po yongs su dag
par gyur pa+i phyir dang //
ting nge 'dzin **gyi** la snyoms par +jug
par'i⁹ phyir dang //¹⁰

des bar thob pa'i phyir dang /
de kho na nyid kyi don shes shing rnam
par grol ba thob pa+i phyir dang ///

- 1 B, L, P: add /. (J illegible.)
- 2 B, M, S: omit *dge sbyong*. P is very cramped in this phrase, but would fit perfectly if *dge sbyong* were omitted; P was undoubtedly corrected.
- 3 B, J, P: // for /.
- 4 B, P: insert /.
- 5 B, C, D, J, P: insert /.
- 6 F, L, M: *yongsu*.
- 7 F, L, M: *tinge*.
- 8 B, P: *las* for *la*.
- 9 Dh2 seems to omit the whole expression *dge sbyong zhes bya ba* /.
- 10 B, F, L, P, S: *ba* for *ba'i*.

- 8) nam par^q thar pa'i sgo gsum nam par thar pa+i sgo gsum [X X]
 la som nyi med cing¹ the tsam¹¹ myed¹² pa+i phyir ... ¹³
 tshom² mi za ba dang /

1) Dh1: +das. 2) Dh1, ba. 3) Dh1: +od. 4) Dh2, srungs. 5) Dh1: +dis. 6) Here ends manuscript Dh1. 7) Dh2: dge sbyong zhes bgyi ba is written below the line. 8) Dh2: may omit zhes at the end of the line, though it is hard to tell from the photo. 9) That is, par plus 'i 10) Dh2: Three illegible letters follow here (erasure?). 11) Or tsom? 12) Or read mya plus cancelled d? 13) This is the end of the manuscript Dh2.

- 9) 'phags pa'i^r spyod yul la³ gnas pa dang /
 10) dran pa^s nye bar gzha^t pa bzhi la gnas pa dang /⁴
 11) yang dag par spong ba bzhi la gnas pa dang /^u
 12) rdzu 'phrul gyi rkang pa bzhi bsgom pa^v bsgoms pa^w dang /
 13) dad^x pa'i dbang po dang ldan pa^y dang /⁵
 14) sangs rgyas la dad^z pa mi phyed pa dang /⁶
 15) chos la dad^{aa} pa mi phyed pa dang /
 16) dge 'dun la dad pa mi phyed pa dang /^{ab}
 17) sangs rgyas dang⁷ chos dang⁸ dge 'dun la shes nas⁹ dad^{ac} pa^{ad} dang ldan pa^{ae} dang /
 18) gzhan gyi dring la mi 'jog pa'i shes pa^{af} dang ldan pa^{ag} dang /
 19) dge ba'i chos nmams la brtson 'grus brtsams pa¹⁰ dang /
 20) srid pa bcom pa^{ah} dang /^{ai}
 21) yang dag par zhugs pa dang /
 22) dran pa¹¹ dang¹² shes bzhin la mkhas pa dang /
 23) sems rtse gcig pa^{aj} dang /
 24) shes rab kyis lhag mthong^{ak} la mkhas pa dang /^{al}
 25) stobs lnga dang ldan pa^{am} dang /^{an}

- 1 B, M, P, S: insert /.
 2 M, S: tsom for tshom.
 3 C, N: la la for la.
 4 J, N: // for /..
 5 B, P: omit /.
 6 B, P: // for /, (P with two spaces between them).
 7 D, L, S: insert /.
 8 D, L, S: insert /.
 9 B, C, D, J, P: pas for nas.
 10 C, P: ba for pa.
 11 F, M: ba for pa..
 12 D, S: insert /.

- 26) nyon mongs pa thams cad^{ao} kyis mi rdzi¹ ba dang /
- 27) byang chub kyī yan lag bdun la bsam gtan pa^{ap} dang /^{aq}
- 28) chos mams kyī brten^{ar} pa shes pa la mkhas pa dang /^{as}
- 29) lam shes pa dang /
- 30) lam la mkhas pa dang /
- 31) yang dag par^{at} lta ba dang /^{au}
- 32) yang dag pa'i ting nge² 'dzin dang /
- 33) zhi gnas^{av} dang /³ lhag mthong^{aw} bsgom⁴ pa la mkhas pa dang /
- 34) so so⁵ yang dag par rig pa bzhi^{ax} la gzhan gyi dring mi 'jog pa^{ay} shes pa⁶ dang ldan pa^{az} dang /
- 35) don la rton^{ba} gyi tshig^{bb} 'bru la mi rton^{bc} pa dang /
- 36) ye shes la rton^{bd} gyi^{be} nam par shes pa la mi^{bf} rton^{bg} pa dang /
- 37) nges pa'i don gyi^{bh} mdo sde la rton^{bi} gyi⁷ drang ba'i don gyi mdo sde la mi rton^{bj} pa dang /^{bk}
- 38) chos nyid la rton^{bl} gyi gang zag la mi rton^{bm} pa^{bn} dang /^{bo}
- 39) bdud bzhi'i lam las shin tu^{bp} 'das pa dang /
- 40) phung po yongs su⁸ shes pa srung^{bq} ba dang /
- 41) nyon mongs pa bsal ba⁹ dang /
- 42) tha ma'i lus 'dzin pa dang /
- 43) 'chi bdag gi lam las^{br} yang dag par 'das pa dang /
- 44) sdug bsngal^{bs} yang dag par¹⁰ yongs su¹¹ shes pa dang /
- 45) kun 'byung ba^{bt} thams cad spangs pa dang /
- 46) 'gog pa mngon sum du^{bu} bya ba^{bv} la zhugs pa^{bw} dang /
- 47) lam bsgom¹² pa^{bx} mal 'byor gyi^{by} rjes su¹³ zhugs pa dang /^{bz}
- 48) 'phags pa'i bden pa^{ca} bzhi^{cb} mthong ba dang /
- 49) gzhan gyi dring la mi 'jog pa dang /

- 1 N, S: *brdzi* for *rdzi*.
- 2 F, L: *tinge*.
- 3 B, L, P: omit /. N: omits *dang* /.
- 4 C, D, J: *sgom* for *bsgom*.
- 5 C *sor*. F *sau*. P: one space after second *so*.
- 6 C, D, J, P: *rab* for *pa*.
- 7 P: *kyi* for *gyi*. F, M, S: insert /.
- 8 F, L, M: *yongsu*.
- 9 B, F, P: *btsal pa* for *bsal ba*.
- 10 B, F, L: *pa* for *par*.
- 11 F, L, M: *yongsu*.
- 12 C, D, J: *sgom* for *bsgom*.
- 13 F, L, M: *rjesu*.

- 50) ston pa'i bstan pa^{cc} la bya ba byas pa dang /
 51) byed pa byas pa^{cd} dang /
 52) zag pa^{ce} zad pa^{cf} dang /
 53) nmam par thar pa brgyad la bsam gtan pa dang /
 54) brgya byin dang /¹ tshangs pa dang / 'jig rten skyong^{cg} bas bsu ba dang /
 55) sngon gyi spyod pa dang /² bsam pa^{ch} phun sum tshogs pa dang /
 56) dgong pa la gnas par³ mngon par^{ci} dga' ba dang /
 57) 'phags pa'i rigs^{cj} la gnas pa dang /
 58) sbyangs pa'i^{ck} yon^{cl} tan la gnas pa^{cm} dang /
 59) blo gya gyu⁴ med pa dang /
 60) rab tu byung nas⁵ khyim gyi^{cn} gnas dang^{co} mi 'dre ba dang /
 61) bse ru ltar gcig pu^{cp} rgyu ba dang /
 62) 'du 'dzis 'jigs^{cq} skrag pa dang /
 63) kham s gsum⁶ las^{cr} nmam par^{cs} grol^{ct} ba⁷ dang /^{cu}
 64) rtag tu 'jigs^{cv} pa'i yid dang ldan pa^{cw} dang /
 65) yang dag pa'i dge sbyong^{cx} gi tshul la gnas pa^{cY} dang /
 66) thams cad^{cz} la 'dod pa^{da} med pa dang /
 67) 'jig rten gyi^{db} chos brgyad po rnyed pa dang⁸ ma rnyed pa dang / grags pa
 dang /⁹ ma grags pa dang /¹⁰ bde ba dang /¹¹ sdug bsngal ba dang / bstod pa
 dang /¹² smad^{dc} pa mams las^{dd} yang dag par 'das^{de} pa dang /
 68) sa^{df} dang mtshungs pa'i^{dg} sems kyis nye bar bsgrubs te^{dh} gnas pa dang /
 69) bdag dang gzhan rjes^{di} su¹³ srung^{dj} ba dang /^{dk}
 70) 'khrul pa¹⁴ med^{dl} pa dang /
 71) 'khrug pa^{dm} med^{dn} pa dang /^{do}
 72) yang dag par zhugs pa dang /

- 1 F, N: omit /.
 2 B, L, N, P, S: omit /.
 3 B, P: *pa la* for *par*.
 4 B: *gya gyur* for *gya gyu*. P *gyar gyur* for *gya gyu*.
 5 D, J, N, S: insert /. C has one space here.
 6 C, D, J: insert *ma lus pa*.
 7 B, D, P: *pa* for *ba*.
 8 F, M, N, S: insert /.
 9 B, C, D, J, P: omit /.
 10 B, P: omit / [P at end of line].
 11 B, C, D, J, P: omit /.
 12 B, P: omit /.
 13 L, M: *rjesu*.
 14 B, F, P: *ba* for *pa*.

- 73) nam mkha'¹ dang mtshungs pa'i^{dp} sems kyis^{dq} nye bar bsgrubs te gnas pa
dang /dr
- 74) mtshan ma^{ds} thams cad^{dt} la de'i sems^{du} mi chags mi 'ching ste /² dper na
nam^{dv} mkha'³ la^{dw} lag mthil^{dx} bzhin du^{dy} mi chags^{dz} mi 'ching ba yin te /
'od srung^{ea} dge sbyong gi^{eb} chos nam pa de lta bu^{ec} de^{ed} dag dang ldan na⁴ dge
sbyong^{ee} dge sbyong zhes bya'o //ef

L3 B 151b2, D153a3, F204a2, J 166a2, L169b2, M208b8, N 263a3, P148a3, S250b6:

de nas bcom ldan 'das^a la^b tshe dang^c ldan pa^d 'od srung^e chen pos^f 'di skad ces gsol to //
bcom ldan 'das^g 'di lta^h de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom paⁱ yang dag par rdzogs paⁱ
sangs rgyas kyis⁵ yang dag paⁱ dge sbyong gi yon tan 'di dag^k yang dag par rab tu
bstan pa ni^l ngo mtshar to // bcom ldan 'das ma mchis paⁱ dus na⁶ gang dag de bzhin^m
gshegs paⁱ byang chub bskaⁿ paⁿ grangs ma mchis par^o yang dag par^p bsgrubs pa⁷ nub⁸
par bgyid pa⁹ dge sbyong ma lags^q la^r dge sbyong du mchid^s kyis 'che^t zhing /¹⁰ tshangs
par spyod pa^u ma lags par tshangs par spyod^v par mchid^w kyis^x 'che baⁱ dge slong¹¹ la
la dag 'byung bar 'gyur lags sam^y /¹² bcom ldan 'das kyis^z bka' stsal pa /¹³ 'od srung^{aa}
nga dang /¹⁴ khyod dang¹⁵ nyan thos chen po 'di dag kyang^{ab} yongs su¹⁶ mya ngan las
'das^{ac} shing / byang chub sems dpa^{ad} 'di dag kyang sangs rgyas^{ae} kyi shing¹⁷ gzhan
du^{af} dong nas¹⁸ bstan pa^{ag} 'diah rab tu 'jigai par 'gyur ba¹⁹ ni^{aj} tshig gis bstan^{ak} par mi
nus so²⁰ // 'od srung^{al} de la dge^{am} slong^{an} lus ma bsgoms pa^{ao} /²¹ tshulap khrims ma^{aq}

- 1 F: *namkha'*. L, M: *namkha'*.
2 C, D, J: omit /.
3 F, J, L, M: *namkha'*.
4 F, L, M: insert /.
5 L, P [end of line]: insert /.
6 B, L, P: insert /.
7 C, J: omit *pa*.
8 D, J, N: *nus* for *nub*.
9 M, N, S: insert /.
10 F, M: omit /.
11 F, L: *sbyong* for *slong*. D, J, N, P: insert *gang*. P cramped, but would fit perfectly if *gang* were omitted.
12 B, J (?), P: // for /.
13 B, P: // for /.
14 M, N: omit /.
15 L, S: insert / . J, N: space of two letters.
16 F, M: *yongsu*. N: space of three letters.
17 B, M, N, P, S: *zhing* for *shing*.
18 F, M, S: insert /.
19 B, D, N: *pa* for *ba*. N: space of four letters.
20 F, L: *nuso*.
21 B, P: // for /.

bsgoms pa / sems ma bsgoms¹ pa / shes rab ma bsgoms pa^{ar} / byis pa² dman pa³ /^{as} glen
 pa^{at} /⁴ rmongs pa^{au} / rab tu^{av} ma zhi ba / ma dul ba /⁵ kha cig^{aw} 'byung bar 'gyur te / de
 dag gi^{ax} g-yo dang /^{ay} sgyu dang^{az} / mi drang^{ba} ba dang⁶ / gy^abb gyu dang / dge sbyong
 gi dri ma dang / dge sbyong gi skyon mams brjod par bya'o //

I.4 B 152a1, D153b1, F204b1, J 166a7, L169b8, M209a6, N 264a1, P148b1, S251a7:

'od srung^a de la dge sbyong gi dri ma mams gang zhe na /⁷ 'od srung^b sum cu⁸ rtsa
 gnyis po^c 'di^d dag ni^e dge sbyong gi dri ma ste / de dag spangs na⁹ dge sbyong dge
 sbyong zhes bya'o // sum^f cu^g rtsa gnyis gang zhes¹⁰ na /¹¹

- (1) 'dod pa la mam par^h rtog pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹²
- (2) gnod semsⁱ kyi mam par rtog pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹³
- (3) nmam parⁱ 'tshe baⁱ nmam par rtog pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹⁴
- (4) bdag la bstod^k pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹⁵
- (5) gzhan la brnyas^l pa^m dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹⁶
- (6) mi 'thun¹⁷ paⁱn myed pa kun tu¹⁸ tshol ba dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹⁹
- (7) rnyed pas²⁰ rnyed par byed 'dod pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /²¹
- (8) dad pas^o byin^p pa chud^q gzon^r pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /²²
- (9) ltung ba^s 'chab pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /²³

- 1 B, P: *sgoms* for *bsgoms*.
- 2 B, P, S: insert /. F: inserts *dang* /.
- 3 M, P: *ba* for *pa*.
- 4 L, M, N: omit /.
- 5 D, J, L, S: omit /.
- 6 C, J: *dri ma dang* for *mi drang ba dang*.
- 7 B, P: // for /.
- 8 B, F, J, P: *bcu* for *cu*.
- 9 L, M: insert /. S: *nas* for *na*.
- 10 F, L: *zhe* for *zhes*.
- 11 B, P: // for /.
- 12 B, P: // for /.
- 13 B, P: // for /.
- 14 B, P: // for /.
- 15 B, P: // for /.
- 16 C: omits /. B, P: // for /.
- 17 C, F, J, N, S: *mithun* for *'thun*.
- 18 D, J, N: *du* for *tu*.
- 19 B, P: // for /.
- 20 P pa. **CHECK B**
- 21 B, P: // for /.
- 22 B, N, P: // for /.
- 23 B, P: // for /.

- (10) khyim^t pa la sten¹ pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /²
 (11) rab tu byung^u ba dang³ sten⁴ pa^v dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /⁵
 (12) 'du 'dzi^w la^x mngon par^y dga' ba dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /⁶
 (13) rnyed pa yongs su⁷ ma grub par rtog^z pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /⁸
 (14) bdag gi rnyed pas^{aa} chog par^{ab} mi 'dzin pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /⁹
 (15) pha rol bsod nams kyis¹⁰ rnyed pa la^{ac} phrag^{ad} dog dang^{ae} ser sna byed pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹¹
 (16) pha rol gyi rnyed pa la 'dod pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹²
 (17) bdag gi 'khrul pa la mi rtog pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹³
 (18) gzhan gyi 'khrul pa yongs su^{af} tshol ba^{ag} dge^{ah} sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹⁴
 (19) so sor thar pa dang^{ai} 'dul ba mi srung ba dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹⁵
 (20) khwa ltar mu cor smra ba dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹⁶
 (21) ma gus^{aj} pa dang /¹⁷ rgod pa dang /¹⁸ khengs pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /¹⁹
 (22) lta bas kun nas dkris pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /²⁰
 (23) rten cing 'brel par^{ak} 'byung ba^{al} dang^{am} 'gal ba^{an} dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /²¹
 (24) mthar lta ba^{ao} la gnas pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /²²
 (25) 'khor ba^{ap} la mngon par^{aq} dga' ba dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /²³

- 1 F, S: rten for sten. N: brten for sten.
 2 B, P: // for /.
 3 B, P: insert mi.
 4 L: bsten for sten. N: brten for sten.
 5 B, P: // for /.
 6 B, P: // for /.
 7 F, L, M, N: yongsu.
 8 B, P: // for /.
 9 B, P: // for /.
 10 D, J, M, P: snyoms for nams, and D, J, P omit kyis. M: inserts rnams before kyis. P: about three spaces filled with tshogs after snyoms. L: kyi for kyis.
 11 B, P: // for /.
 12 B, P: // for /.
 13 B, P: // for /.
 14 B, P: // for /.
 15 B, P: // for /.
 16 P / cramped. B: // for /.
 17 B, L, M, N, P: omit /.
 18 B, L, N, P: omit /.
 19 B, P: // for /.
 20 B, P: // for / [P cramped].
 21 B, P: // for /.
 22 B, P: // for /.
 23 B, P: // for / [P very cramped].

- (26) mya ngan las 'das pa la mngon par^{ar} mi^{as} dga' ba dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /^a
- (27) 'jig rten rgyang phan¹ pa'i² gsang tshig 'dzin pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /³
- (28) sgrib pas kun nas dkris^{au} pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /⁴
- (29) las kyi mam par^{av} smin pa dang⁵ 'gal ba^{aw} dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /^{ax}
- (30) mam par^{ay} thar pa'i sgo gsum^{az} gyis skrag^{ba} pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /⁶
- (31) chos zab mo spong^{bb} ba dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /⁷
- (32) chos dang 'gal bar gnas pa dge sbyong gi dri ma dang /⁸
- (33) dkon mchog gsum⁹ la mi gus ba¹⁰ dge sbyong gi dri ma ste^{bc} /¹¹
- 'od srung^{bd} sum cu^{be} rtsa gnyis po de dag ni dge sbyong gi dri ma ste^{bf} / de dag spangs na^{bg} dge sbyong dge sbyong zhes bya'o //

I. 5 B 152b5, D154a1, F205a6, J 166b8, L170b2, M210a1, N 264b7, P149a3, S252a5:

'od srung^a brgyad^b po 'di dag ni dge sbyong gi chos kyi sgrib pa ste /^c brgyad gang zhe na /¹² 'di lta ste /^d

- (1) bla ma mams la mi gus pa dang /
- (2) chos mams la rim gro med pa dang /
- (3) tshul bzhin ma yin pa^e yid la byed pa dang /
- (4) ma thos pa'i mdo sde^f spong ba dang /
- (5) bdag med pa¹³ sems can^g med pa /¹⁴ srog med pa^h /¹⁵ gang zag med pa'i chosⁱ kyis skrag pa dang^j /

- 1 B: *pa na* for *phan*. L, M: *pan* for *phan*. S: '*phen* for *phan*.
- 2 B, M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 3 B, P: // for /.
- 4 B, P: // for /.
- 5 B: inserts //. L, M: insert /.
- 6 B, P: // for /.
- 7 B, P: // for /.
- 8 B, P: // for /.
- 9 B, P: omit *gsum*.
- 10 B, F, L, P, S: *pa* for *ba*
- 11 B, P: // for /.
- 12 D, J: omit /.
- 13 F, M, S: insert /. N: inserts *dang*.
- 14 B, N, P: omit /.
- 15 B, L, P: omit /.

(6) 'dus ma byas kyi¹ chos bstan^k pa la mi 'jug gi² 'dus byas nyid kyi rjes su³
snyegs⁴ pa dang /

(7) 'du byed mams ma skyes pa zhes thos na¹ skrag pa dang /

(8) chos thams cad⁵ rang ... saṃmohaṃ nigacchati •
bzhin gyis ma skyes pa
zhes^m thos na g-yang sa⁶
chen por ltungⁿ ba bzhin
du ltung ba^o ste /

'od srung^p brgyad po 'di⁷ dag ni^q dge
sbyong gi chos kyi sgrib pa ste /^r rab
tu byung bas de dag yongs su⁸ spang
bar⁹ bya'o //^s

ime kāśyapa aṣṭau śramaṇadharmā-
varaṇās te pravrajitena parivarjayi-
tavyāḥ //

I.6 B 153a1, D 154a4, F 205b2, J 167a3, L 170b5, M 210a5, N 265a4, P 149a6, S 252b1:

'od srung^a dge sbyong^b ni^c kha dog
dang^d rtags kyi dbyibs¹⁰ kyis dge
sbyong zhes nga mi 'chad kyi¹¹ /¹² yon
tan gyi chos la nan tan^e byed pa'i dge
sbyong ni dge sbyong ngo^f zhes^g
ngas^h bshad do¹³ //i

nāhaṃ kāśyapa śramaṇalingasaṃsthā-
panam idam iti vadāmi • guṇa-
dharmaṃ pratipatyāhaṃ kāśyapa
śramaṇam iti vadāmi •

'od srung^j dge sbyong gis ni mnyog pa
med pa'i sems kyis lus la ngur smrig
dag bcang bar bya'o //k

śramaṇena kāśyapa kāye 'smiṃ
kāśāyan dhārayamāṇena niṣkāśāyeṇa
tena bhavitavyaṃ •

1 B, P: pa'i for kyi.

2 D, J: par for gi. B, F, P: insert /.

3 F, L, M, N: rjesu.

4 B: rnyeg for snyegs. P: rnyags for snyegs. N, S: snyeg for snyegs.

5 F, M: thamd. N: rnams for thams cad.

6 B, P: g-yangs for g-yang sa.

7 D, J: de for 'di.

8 F, L, M, N: yongsu.

9 F, M: par for bar.

10 B, N, P: dbyings for dbyibs.

11 B, P: kyis for kyi

12 B, P: omit /.

13 F, M: bshado.

de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'od srung¹ myog
 pa med pa la ngas ngur smrig gnang gi
 / 'od srung^m gangⁿ myog pa dang^o
 bcas pas^p lus la ngur smrig dag
 'chang^q ba de dag thams cad¹ ni ngur
 smrig tshig pa'o zhes bshad de /² bsam
 pas^r mos pa mams ni ma gtogs so³ //s

de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'di⁴ ni 'phags pa
 mams kyi rgyal mtshan yin pa'i^t phyir
 te / skyo zhing 'dod chags dang bral
 bar spyod pa mams kyi^u gos 'di dag ni
 nye bar zhi ba'i rjes su⁵ 'thun⁶ pa^v
 byams^w pa'i rjes su⁷ zhugs pa'o //⁸ 'od
 srung^x de la 'phags pa mams kyi rgyal
 mtshan gang zhe na / 'od srung^y bcu
 gnyis po 'di dag ni 'phags pa mams kyi
 rgyal mtshan te^z / bcu gnyis gang zhe
 na / 'od srung^{aa}

- (1) tshul khirms 'phags pa
 mams kyi rgyal mtshan
 dang /
- (2) ting nge⁹ 'dzin 'phags pa
 mams kyi rgyal mtshan
 dang /
- (3) shes rab 'phags pa mams
 kyi rgyal mtshan dang /

tat kasmād dhetoḥ niṣkaṣāyasya
 kāśyapa kāṣāyam anujñātam\ yah
 kaścit kāśyapa sakaṣāyah kāye 'smim
 kāṣāyam dhārayati anyatrāśayādhi-
 muktyā sarvāms tām kāṣāyadagdhān iti
 vadāmi

tat kasmād dhetoḥ āryāṇāmm eṣa
 kāśyapa dhvajah upaśammanukūlo
 maitrānuyukta iti virāgacaritānāmm
 etāni vastrāṇi • tatra kāśyapa ya
 āryāṇāṃ dhvajās tām śrṇuṣva • dvā-
 daśeme kāśyapa āryāṇāṃ dhvajāḥ
 katame dvādaśa

... pa āryāṇāṃ dhvajam\ 1

samādhir āryāṇāṃ dhvajah 2

prajñā āryāṇāṃ dhvajah 3

1 F, M: *tharid*.
 2 B, P: *do* // for *de* /.
 3 F, L, M, N: *gtogso*.
 4 D, J: *de* for 'di.
 5 F, L, M, N: *rjesu*
 6 F, L, N, S: *mtshun* for 'thun.
 7 F, L, M, N: *rjesu*.
 8 B, P: / for // [P at end of line].
 9 F, L, M, N: *tinge*.

- | | | |
|------|---|---|
| (4) | rnam par ^{ab} grol ba 'phags
pa rnam kyī rgyal mtshan
dang / | vimuktir āryāṇām dhvajah 4 |
| (5) | rnam par ^{ac} grol ba'i ¹ ye
shes mthong ^{ad} ba 'phags
pa rnam kyī rgyal mtshan
dang / | vimuktijñānadarśanam āryāṇām
dhvajah 5 |
| (6) | bden pa ^{ae} la 'jug pa 'phags
pa ^{af} nam kyī rgyal
mtshan dang / | satyāvatāra āryāṇām dhvajah 6 |
| (7) | rten cing 'brel par ² 'byung
ba la 'jug pa 'phags pa ^{ag}
nam kyī rgyal mtshan
dang / | pratītyasamutpādānubuddhyanatā
āryāṇām dhvajah 7 |
| (8) | bsam gtan bzhi 'phags pa
nam kyī rgyal mtshan
dang / | catvāro brahmavihārā āryāṇām dhvajah
8 |
| (9) | tshad med pa bzhi 'phags
pa nam kyī rgyal mtshan
dang / | catvāri dhyānāni āryāṇām dhvajah 9 |
| (10) | gzugs med pa'i snyoms
par 'jug pa bzhi 'phags pa
nam kyī rgyal mtshan
dang / | catastra ārūpyasamāpattaya āryāṇām
dhvajah 10 |
| (11) | skyon med pa la 'jug pa
'phags pa ^{ah} nam kyī ^{ai}
rgyal mtshan dang / | niyāmāvakkrāntir āryāṇām dhvajah 11 |
| (12) | zag pa zad pa 'phags pa
nam kyī rgyal mtshan
te ^{aj} / | |

1

B, F, L: *ba* for *ba'i*. P: *ba'i* very cramped.

2

B, F, L: *bar* for *par*.

'od srung^{ak} bcu gnyis po^{al} de^{am} dag ni
'phags pa mams kyi¹ rgyal mtshan
no^{an} //2

ime kāśyapa dvādaśāryāṇāṃ dhvajāḥ

I. 7 B 153b4, D 154b3, F 206a3, J 167b2, L 171a5, M 210b5, N 265b7, P 149b7, S 253a3:

'od srung^a gang la la rgyal mtshan 'di
dag dang^b mi^c ldan par^d 'phags pa'i
rigs^e gos ngur smrig dag 'chang ba de^f
ni nor pa'i³ chos la zhugs pa'o^g zhes
ngas bshad do^h //i

tatra kāśyapa yo bhikṣur ebhir
dharmair ananugataḥ āryāṇāṃ dhvajam
kāśāyavastraṃ kāye dhārayati tam
aham vitathadharmapratipannam iti
vadāmi •

chos dang 'gal bar gnas pa zhes bshad
do⁴ //j

uḍḍaradharmavihāriṇam iti vadāmi •

de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan^k pa las ring
du gnas pa zhes bshad do⁵ //l

tathāgataśāsanadūsthitam iti vadāmi

mya ngan las^m 'das pa'i phyogs kyi mi
'thun⁶ pa'i phyogs la gnas pa zhes
bshad do⁷ //n

nirvāṇapakṣavipakṣasthitam iti vadāmi

•

'khor ba'i phyogs dang 'thun⁸ pa^o zhes
bshad do⁹ //p

samskārapakṣānukūlam iti vadāmi •

nga rgyal gyi mchil pas zin pa zhes
bshad do^q //r

mārabaddhagrastam iti vadā[mī]

snying po ma blangs pa zhes bshad do¹⁰ //s chos las nyams pa zhes bshad do¹¹ //t nyam^u
nga ba'i lam la gnas pa zhes bshad do¹² //v 'od srung^w de lta bas na¹³ dge sbyong^x gis^y

- 1 B, P: *kyis* for *kyi*.
- 2 J, P: / for // [P at end of line].
- 3 F, P: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 4 F, M: *bshado*.
- 5 F, M: *bshado*.
- 6 F, J, N, S: *mithun* for *'thun*.
- 7 F, M: *bshado*.
- 8 L, N, S: *mithun* for *'thun*.
- 9 F, L, M, N: *bshado*.
- 10 F, M: *bshado*.
- 11 F, L, M: *bshado*.
- 12 F, L, M: *bshado*.
- 13 B, P: insert /.

lus la ngur smrig^z dag bcang¹ ba^{aa} lta² na rnyog pa med pa'i sems su³ bya'o //ab

I.8 B 153b8, D 154b5, F 206a7, J 167b5, L 171a8, M 211a1, N 266a5, P150a1, S253a7; Śikṣ: D 77a5, P 90a6:

gal te des 'bras bu thob par ma gyur na⁴ des^a gus pa brgyad kyis lus la^b ngur smrig dag
bcang bar bya ste / brgyad gang zhe na /

- (1) mchod rten gyi 'du^c shes dang /
- (2) ston pa'i^d 'du^e shes dang /^f
- (3) nye bar zhi ba'i 'du^g shes dang /
- (4) byams pa'i 'du shes dang /
- (5) sangs rgyas^h la gus pa'i 'du shes dang /
- (6) ngo tsha shes pa'i 'du shes dang /
- (7) khrel yod pa'iⁱ 'du shes dang /
- (8) rnyog pa^j med par bya'o^k snyam pa ste /

dge sbyong gi tshul dang⁵ 'thun⁶ pa'i^l phyir⁷ gus pa brgyad po de dag gis lus la ngur
smrig dag bcang bar bya'o //

'od srung⁸ gang dag lhod cing yang
dag par^m mi⁹ sdomⁿ pa dang^o /¹⁰ dge
sbyong gi yon tan gyi chos 'di dag las
nyams par¹¹ lus la¹² ngur smrig dag^p
'chang ba mams ni¹³ gus pa 'di dag¹⁴
mi skyed¹⁵ do^q //r

ye punas te kāśyapa vaidaryā asaṃyatā
itaḥ śramaṇaguṇadharmād uddhurāḥ
kāye kāśāyāṇi vastrāṇi dhārayanti / na
caiteṣu gauravam utpādayanti / <Śikṣ

136.9-10>

I.9 B 154a4, D 155a1, F 206b3, J 167b8, L 171b3, M 211a4, N 266b2, P 150a4, S 253b4; Śikṣ D

- 1 D, J, N: 'chang for bcang.
- 2 D, J: omit lta.
- 3 F, L, M: semsu.
- 4 B, P: nas for na, and insert /. L, M, N, S: insert /.
- 5 B: inserts /. P: one space.
- 6 F, L, N, S: mihun for 'thun.
- 7 L, M: insert /. N: omits phyir.
- 8 S, Śikṣ D, P: srungs for srung.
- 9 B: omits mi. J, P: ma for mi. P: par ma cramped.
- 10 N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 11 Śikṣ D, P: pa for par.
- 12 B, P: insert gos.
- 13 N: mi for ni. Śikṣ D, P: insert de la.
- 14 Śikṣ D, P: omit 'di dag.
- 15 L: bskyod for skyed. N: bskyed for skyed.

77a5, P 90a7:

'od srung¹ dge sbyong^a gi kha dog
dang² gzugs can la gnod pa byed pa^b
zhes bya ba³ nyi^c tshe ba'i⁴ sems can^d
dmyal ba yod de⁵ /e 'od srung⁶ nyi tshe
ba'i⁷ sems can^f dmyal ba der dge
sbyong gi gzugs su⁸ gyur bzhin du⁹
gos 'bar ba dag^g dang /¹⁰ mgo^h 'bar ba
dag dang /¹¹ lhung bzed 'bar ba dagⁱ
dang /¹² stan 'bar ba dag^j dang /¹³ mal
cha^k 'bar ba dag gnod pa¹⁴ byed de¹⁵ /
de dag^l gi long^m spyod dang /¹⁶
yongs su¹⁷ spyadⁿ pa gang ci yod pa
de dag¹⁸ thams cad^o 'bar¹⁹ rab tu 'bar
te^p /²⁰ kun du²¹ rab tu mched cing 'bar
la^q de mer²² gyur te / dge sbyong gi^r
kha dog dang²³ gzugs kyis gnod pa de
dag myong bar 'gyur ro²⁴ //

tatra kāśyapa śramaṇavarṇaprati-
rūpakam nāma pratyekanarakam / tatra
kāśyapa pratyekanarake śramaṇaprati-
rūpeṇa tāḥ kāraṇāḥ kāryante ādīptacailā
ādīptaśīrṣā ādīptapātrā ādīptāsanā
ādīptaśayanāḥ / yaḥ kaścīt tatra teṣāṃ
upabhogaparibhogaḥ sa sarva ādīptaḥ
saṃprajvalita ekajvālībhūtaḥ / tatra taiḥ
śramaṇavarṇarūpeṇa duṣkham
vedanām anubhavanti <Śikṣ 136.10-14>

- 1 S, Śikṣ D, P: *srungs* for *srung*. Śikṣ P: inserts *de la*.
- 2 F, M: insert /.
- 3 Śikṣ D, P: *ba'i* for *ba*.
- 4 L, S: *tshe'i* for *tshe ba'i*.
- 5 F, M: *yode*. Śikṣ D: *do* for *de*.
- 6 S, Śikṣ D, P: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 7 L, S: *tshe'i* for *tshe ba'i*.
- 8 B, F, L, M, N: *gzugsu*.
- 9 F, M, N: insert /.
- 10 B, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 11 B, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 12 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 13 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 14 L, M, N: *par* for *pa*.
- 15 M, N: *byede*.
- 16 D, J, L, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 17 F, L, M: *yongsu*.
- 18 B, L, Śikṣ P: omit *dag*. P: *dag* cramped.
- 19 B, P: insert /.
- 20 D, J, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 21 B, F, L, S, Śikṣ D, P: *tu* for *du*.
- 22 J: *mir* for *mer*. Śikṣ D, P: *me lce gcig tu* for *mer*.
- 23 B, L, M, P: insert /.
- 24 F, M: *'gyuro*.

de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'di ltar lus dang¹ ngag dang² yid kyis³ las yongs su³ ma dag pa dang
ldan pa'i phyir te / lus dang^t ngag dang^u yid kyis^s las yongs su⁴ ma dag pa dang ldan pa^v
de dag gi 'gro ba yang^w yongs su⁵ ma dag pa nyid du 'gyur ro⁶ //

I.10 B 154b1, D 155a3, F 206b7, J 168a3, L 171b7, M 211a8, N 266b6, P150a8, S254a1:
'od srunga^a dge sbyong ma yin^b la⁷ dge sbyong⁸ du khas 'che⁹ ba dang / tshangs par
spyod pa ma^c yin¹⁰ la¹¹ tshangs par^d spyod¹² par khas 'che ba gang zhig tshul khrims
dang ldan^e pa^f rnams dang / yon tan dang ldan pa^g rnams kyis phyag byas pa^h bdag gir
byed na¹³ de mi dge ba'i las¹⁴ des brnyasⁱ pa brgyad 'thob¹⁵ stej /^k brgyad gang zhe na /

- 1) bems po lta bur 'gyur ba^l dang /
- 2) go dka^m zhing le lo can du 'gyur ba¹⁶ dang /
- 3) skye bo mang pos¹⁷ bgadⁿ pa'i¹⁸ bud^o med du^p 'gyur ba dang /
- 4) rang dbang med cing bran du 'gyur ba^q dang /
- 5) mdog ngan cing¹⁹ mi sdug par 'gyur ba dang /
- 6) mdog ngan cing²⁰ dbang chung bar^r grags par 'gyur ba dang /
- 7) de la su yang^s bsu²¹ bar^t mi 'gyur ba dang /
- 8) sbyin gnas rnams la^u mgu bar^v mi byed pa ste /

- 1 M, S: insert /.
- 2 M, S: insert /.
- 3 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 4 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 5 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 6 F, M, N: *'gyuro*.
- 7 M, S: insert /.
- 8 B: omits *ma yin la dge sbyong*, and see next note for P.
- 9 B: *mche* for *'che*. P: *'od srung dge sbyong ma yin la dge sbyong du khas 'che* very cramped, and see previous note for B.
- 10 F, N: insert *pa*.
- 11 F, M, S: insert /.
- 12 D, J: *spyad* for *spyod*.
- 13 F: *pa* for *na*. B, L, M, P, S: insert /.
- 14 F, M, S: *chos* for *las*.
- 15 B, F, P: *thob* for *'thob*.
- 16 F, P: *pa* for *ba*.
- 17 B, P: *po* for *pos*.
- 18 B, N, P: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 19 D, F, J: *zhing* for *cing*.
- 20 D, J: *zhing* for *cing*.
- 21 B, F: *su* for *bsu*. D, J, P: *stsu* for *bsu*. N: *btsu* for *bsu*. P: one space after *stsu*.

brnyas pa brgyad po de^w dag 'thob^x bo¹ // 'od srung^y de lta bas na^z bzang po ma yin
pa'i^{aa} chos 'di lta bu 'di dag^{ab} thos nas² dge slong³ sdig pa can gyis gzhan gyis phyag
byas pa bdag gir mi bya'o⁴ //ac

I.11 B 154b6, D 155a7, F 207a4, J 168a7, L 172a2, M 211b4, N 267a5, P 150b4, S 254a6:
'od srung^a gang^b dge sbyong ma yin⁵ la^c dge sbyong du⁶ khas 'che ba dang / tshangs par
spyod pa ma yin⁷ la⁸ tshangs par spyod par khas 'che ba ni^d tha na sa chen po 'di la
mchil ma'i thal ba⁹ tsam 'dor ba de yang^e des^f rnyed par mi 'gyur na /¹⁰ gom pa 'deg¹¹
pa^g dang¹² 'jog^h pa lta ci smos /¹³ de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'od srungⁱ sa' chen po 'di ni sngon
gyi rgyal po mams kyis¹⁴ tshul^k khirms dang ldan pa^l mams dang / yon tan dang ldan
pa^m mams dang / sbyin gnasⁿ mams la kun tu^o spyad¹⁵ pa'i don du^p phul¹⁶ ba'i phyir
ro^q //

I.12 B 155a1, D 155b1, F 207a7, J 168b1, L 172a5, M 211b7, N 267a7, P 150b6, S 254b1:
'od srung¹⁷ de la mi blun po de ni gom pa 'jog pa dang¹⁸ 'dor ba gang yin pa de¹⁹ thams
cad^a kyang^b dad pas byin pa la mi dbang bzhi^c du^c gom pa 'dor zhing 'jog pa yin na^d /²⁰
dge 'dun gyi 'am /^e phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi khri 'am /²¹ khri'u 'am^f /^g 'chag sa^h 'am /
gding ba 'am / gnas khang ngamⁱ / gtsug lag khang ngam / kun dga' ra ba' 'am /^k kun
dga^l ra ba'i gzhi 'am /^m yongs su²² spyad pa 'am / lhung bzed damⁿ / chos gos sam /
bsod snyoms sam / mal cha^o 'am /^p na ba'i gsos sman nam /^q yo byad kyang rung ste /

- 1 B, F, N, P: *po* for *bo*.
- 2 B, L, M, P, S: insert /.
- 3 D, M: *sbyong* for *slong*.
- 4 D, J: *bya'i* for *bya'o*.
- 5 F, N: insert *pa*.
- 6 B, P: *yin par* for *du*.
- 7 F, N: insert *pa*.
- 8 B, M, P, S: insert /.
- 9 B, F, L: *pa* for *ba*.
- 10 D, J: omit /.
- 11 F, M: '*degs* for '*deg*. L: '*jog* for '*deg*. N: '*debs* for '*deg*.
- 12 B, F, N, P, S: insert /.
- 13 B, P: // for /.
- 14 S: omits *kyis*. B, P: insert /.
- 15 B, P: *spyod* for *spyad*.
- 16 B: '*bul* for *phul*. P: '*phul* for *phul*.
- 17 F, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 18 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 19 D, J, P: insert *ni* (P: cramped slightly). N: inserts *dag*.
- 20 D, J: omit /.
- 21 M, P [end of line]: omit /.
- 22 F, L, M: *yongsu*.

thams cad^r dad^s pas byin pa la mi dbang par¹ spyod pa yin pa^t lta ci smos /² 'od srung^u
khyod^v mos par bya'o // ^w khyod kyis³ khong du chud par bya'o // ^x

I.13 B 155a4, D 155b4, F 207b2, J 168b4, L 172a7, M 212a2, N 267b4, P 151a2, S 254b5:
'od srung^a dge sbyong ma yin⁴ la⁵ dge sbyong du khas 'che ba dang / tshangs par spyod
pa ma yin⁶ la⁷ tshangs par spyod par khas 'che bas ni⁸ dad pas byin pa⁹ skra'i rtse mo'i^b
cha¹⁰ tsam yang yongs su¹¹ dag par bya^c mi nus so¹² // ^d de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'od srung¹³
'phags pa'i dge 'dun ni¹⁴ ngas^e rgya mtsho^f chen po lta bu dang / bsod nams^g kyi zhing
dang / ^h sbyin gnas rnams kyi mchog tu bstanⁱ pa'i phyir roj // 'od srung^k bram ze 'am / ¹⁵
khyim bdag dad¹⁶ pa gang dag de la yon 'bul^l ba de dag tshad med pa'i 'du shes kyis 'bul
ba de la / ¹⁷ 'od srung^m mi blun po tshul khrims 'chalⁿ pas¹⁸ tha na¹⁹ skra'i rtse mo brgyar
gshegs²⁰ pa'i cha tsam zhig dad^o pas byin pa^p yongs su²¹ spyad^q na yang^r sbyin pa po
dang / ^s sbyin bdag deⁱ ²² yongs su²³ sbyang ba'i phyir²⁴ dad pas^t byin pa²⁵ skra'i rtse
mo'i cha^u tsam ji snyed la spyad pa de snyed kyi las kyi rgya mtsho chen po sogs²⁶ par
'gyur ro²⁷ // 'od srung^v de lta bas^w na²⁸ tshul khrims yongs su²⁹ dag pas³⁰ dad pas byin

- 1 B, F, L, P, S: *bar* for *par*.
- 2 B, P: // for /.
- 3 B, F, L, N, P: *kyi* for *kyis*.
- 4 F, N: insert *pa*.
- 5 B, M, S: insert /.
- 6 F, N: insert *pa*.
- 7 M, P, S: insert /.
- 8 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 9 F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 10 L, M, S: insert *shas*.
- 11 B, F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 12 F, L, M: *nuso*.
- 13 N, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 14 B, M, P: insert /.
- 15 D, J, N: omit /.
- 16 B, P: *dang* for *dad*.
- 17 D, F, J: omit /.
- 18 F: *bas* for *pas*. B, P: insert /.
- 19 L, M: insert /.
- 20 M: *bshags* for *gshegs*. F, P, S: *gshags* for *gshegs*.
- 21 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 22 F, M, S: *de* for *de'i*.
- 23 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 24 B, P: insert /.
- 25 B, P: *pa'i* for *pa*. F: *ba* for *pa*.
- 26 B, F, P: *stsogs* for *sogs*. L: *bsogs* for *sogs*.
- 27 F, L, M, N: *'gyuro*.
- 28 B, L, M, P: insert /.
- 29 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 30 B, F, L: *par* for *pas*.

pa^x yongs su¹ spyad par bya'o^y zhes khyod² kyis de ltar bslab par bya'o //

I. 14 B 155b2, D 155b7, F 207b7, J 168b8, L 172b3, M 212a7, N 268a3, P 151a6, S 255a3;
Śikṣ D 77b7, P 91a2:

bstan pa 'di bshad pa na³ rnal 'byor
spyod pa'i dge slong nyis brgyas^a
bstan pa⁴ 'di thos nas⁵ rab tu ngus^b te⁶
mchi ma zag^c cing^d tshig 'di skad ces⁷
bdag cag ni gum^e yang rung ste /^f 'bras
bu ma thob kyī bar du dad pas^g stsal
ba'i⁸ bsod snyoms gcig⁹ tsam yang
yongs su¹⁰ spyad par mi bgyi'o zhes
smras so¹¹ //

atha tasyām eva pariṣadi yogācārāṇām
bhikṣūṇām dve śate imaṃ dharma-
paryāyaṃ śrutvā prarudite / evaṃ ca
vācam abhāṣanta / kālaṃ vayan
bhagavan kariṣyāmo na punar aprāpta-
phalā ekapiṇḍapātam api śraddhā-
deyasya paribhokṣyāmaḥ // <Śikṣ

137.17-19>

bcom ldan 'das^h kyis bka' stsal paⁱ /
skyes bu dam pa dag legs so legs so¹²
//^k ngo tsha^l shes pa dang /¹³ 'gyod pa
dang ldan pa^m dang /¹⁴ 'jig rten pha rol
tu¹⁵ kha na ma tho bas 'jigsⁿ par lta
ba¹⁶ rnam pa 'di lta^o bu dag gis gsung^p
rab 'di mdzes so¹⁷ //q

bhagavān āha / sādhu sādhu kulaputrā
evaṃrūpair lajjābhiḥ kaukrtyasaṃ-
pannaiḥ paralokāvadyabhayadarśibhir
idaṃ pravacanam śobhate // <Śikṣ

138.1-2>

I. 15 B 155b5, D156a2, F 208a3, J 169a2, L 172b6, M 212b2, N 268a6, P 151b1, S 255a6;
Śikṣ D 78a2, P 91a5:

- 1 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 2 L, M, S: *khyed* for *khyod*.
- 3 B, M, P: insert /. Śikṣ D, P: *de nas 'khor de nyid nas* for *bstan pa 'di bshad pa na*.
- 4 Śikṣ D, P: *chos kyī rnam grangs* for *bstan pa*.
- 5 L, M, S: insert /.
- 6 B, P: insert /.
- 7 F, M: : insert /. B, P: insert //. Śikṣ D, P: insert *bcom ldan 'das*.
- 8 B, L, M: *pa'i* for *ba'i*.
- 9 M, Śikṣ D: *cig* for *gcig*.
- 10 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 11 L, M, N: *smraso*.
- 12 F: *legso* for second pair. L, M, N: *legso legso*.
- 13 F, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 14 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 15 F, J, P: *du* for *tu*.
- 16 B, P: *ba'i* for *ba*.
- 17 L, M: *mdzeso*.

'od srung ¹ ngas dge slong ^a gnyis la	dvayor ahaṃ kāśyapa śraddhādeyam
dad pas byin pa ^b gñang ste / gnyis	anujānāmi / katamayor dvayoḥ /
gang zhes ² na / ³ ldan pa ^c dang ⁴ grol	yuktasya muktasya ca / <Śikṣ 138.2-3>
ba'o ^d // ^e	
yang gnyis te ^f / gang ⁵ 'du byed thams cad ^g la mi ^h rtag par lta ba dang / ⁶ gang yang sems	
mam pa ⁱ grol ba byams pa ^j la snyoms par 'jug pa'o // ^k	
dge slong dag de ^l la ⁷ dge slong ldan	yadi bhikṣavo bhikṣur yukto yogācāro
pa ^m rnal 'byor spyod pa ⁸ nga'i bstan pa	mama śikṣāyāṃ pratipannaḥ <Śikṣ
la zhugs pa ⁿ gang zhig ⁹	138.3>
sbyin pa po dang / sbyin bdag las chos gos dang / bsod snyoms dang / mal cha ^o dang / ^p	
na ba'i gsos sman dang / yo byad mams yongs su ¹⁰ spyad nas ¹¹ 'khor ba'i skyon	
mthong / ^q	
'du byed thams cad ^r mi rtag par	sarvasaṃskāreṣv anityadarśi sarva-
mthong / 'du byed thams cad ^s sdug	saṃskāraduḥkhaviditaḥ sarva-
bsngal ^t bar rig / chos thams cad la ¹²	dharmaṣv anātmādhimuktiḥ śānta-
bdag med par mos / ^u mya ngan las ^v	nirvāṇābhikāṅkṣi sumerumātrair
'das pa zhi bar rtogs ^w pas ^x ni ¹³ ri rab	ālopaiḥ śraddhādeyaṃ bhuñjita
tsam gyi ^y kham ^z dag gis ¹⁴ dad pas	atyantapariśuddhaiva tasya sā dakṣiṇā
byin pa ^{aa} yongs su ¹⁵ spyad kyang ¹⁶	bhavati / <Śikṣ 138.3-5>
de'i yon ¹⁷ shin tu ^{ab} yongs su ¹⁸ dag par	
'gyur ro ¹⁹ //	

- 1 S, Śikṣ D, P: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 2 B, F, P: *zhe* for *zhes*.
- 3 D, J: omit /.
- 4 D, J: insert /.
- 5 D, J: omit *gang*.
- 6 D, J: omit / [J two or three letter space].
- 7 Śikṣ D, P: omit *de la*.
- 8 B, L, M, P: insert /.
- 9 L: omits *zhig*. Śikṣ D, P: omit *gang zhig*.
- 10 F, L, N: *yongsu*.
- 11 L, M: insert /.
- 12 B, P: omit *la*.
- 13 B, L, P: insert /.
- 14 D, J: *gi* for *gis*.
- 15 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 16 B, N, P, S: insert /.
- 17 F, Śikṣ D, P: insert *tan*.
- 18 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 19 F, L, M: *'gyuro*.

sbyin pa po dang¹ sbyin bdag gang
 dag^{ac} las dad pas^{ad} byin pa^{ae} yongs
 su² spyad^{af} pa de las de dag gi³ bsod
 nams kyi mam par^{ag} smin pa 'byor pa
 chen po dang /⁴ phan yon chen por
 'gyur ro⁵ // ^{ah}

de ci'i phyir zhe na / dge slong dag
 rdzas las byung ba'i bsod nams^{ai} bya
 ba'i⁶ dngos po nams las⁷ /⁸ gang
 byams pa'i sems la snyoms^{aj} par 'jug
 pa de mchog yin pa'i^{ak} phyir ro⁹ //

yeṣāṃ ca dāyakānāṃ dānapatīnāṃ
 sakāśāc chraddhādeyaṃ paribhuktaṃ
 tatas teṣāṃ dāyakadānapatīnāṃ maha-
 rddhikaḥ puṇyavipāko bhavati mahā-
 dyutkaiḥ / <Śikṣ 138.5-7>
 tat kasmād dhetoḥ / agram idam
 aupadhikānāṃ puṇyakriyāvastūnāṃ
 yeyaṃ maitracittasamāpattiḥ / <Śikṣ
 138.7-8>

I. 16 B 156a3, D 156a6, F 208b1, J 169a7, L 173a3, M 212b7, N 268b6, P 151b6, S 255b5;
 Śikṣ D 78a4, P 91a8:

- 1 D, J: insert /.
- 2 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 3 D, J: *gis* for *gi*.
- 4 B, F, N, P, S, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 5 F, M, N: *'gyuro*.
- 6 B, Śikṣ P: *pa'i* for *ba'i*.
- 7 B, L, M: *pas* for *las*.
- 8 D, J, L, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 9 F, M, N: *phyiro*.

¹ dge slong dag² dge slong gang zhig
 sbyin pa po dang^a /³ sbyin bdag gi⁴
 chos gos dang /⁵ bsod snyoms dang /⁶
 mal cha⁷ dang^b /⁸ yo byad mams
 yongs su⁹ spyad nas¹⁰ sems rnam par^c
 grol ba tshad med pa la snyoms par
 'jug na¹¹ sbyin pa^d po dang /¹² sbyin
 bdag de'i mnam par^e smin pa yang^f
 tshad^g med par shes par bya'o //¹³
 od srung¹⁴ stong gsum gyi stong chen
 po'i^h 'jig rten gyi kham na yod pa'i
 rgya mtsho chen po mams ni yongs
 su¹⁵ zad par 'gyur yang srid kyi /¹⁶ de'i
 bsod namsi kyi rgyu 'thun¹⁷ pa'i ni
 yongs su¹⁸ zad par gang^k yang mi
 'gyur ro¹⁹ //

'od srungs^l gang zhig sbyin pa^m po dang /²⁰ sbyin bdag gi dad pas byin paⁿ yongs su²¹
 spyad nas /²² 'chal pa'i^o tshul khrims kyi log par ltung bar²³ byed na /²⁴ mi gti mug pa
 de gnod pa ji¹ tsam gyi phyir zhugs pa la ltos /² 'od srung^p de lta^q bas na³ dge sbyong gi

tatra kāśyapa yo bhikṣur dāyakasya
 dānapater antikāc cīvarapiṇḍapātaṃ
 paribhujyāpramāṇaṃ cetaḥsamādhim
 samāpadyate 'pramāṇas tasya dāya-
 kasya dānapater puṇyakriyāvipākāḥ
 pratikāṅkṣitavyaḥ / <Śikṣ 138.8-10>

syāt kāśyapa trisāhasramahāsāha-
 srāyāṃ lokadhātau mahāsamudrāṇāṃ
 kṣayo na tv eva tasya puṇyaniṣyanda-
 sya kaścit kṣaya <Śikṣ 138.10-11>

- 1 Śikṣ D, P: insert 'od srungs.
- 2 Śikṣ D, P: omit dge slong dag. L: omits dag.
- 3 B, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 4 B, P: gi for gi. F: bdagi.
- 5 B, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 6 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 7 B, F, M, P: ca for cha.
- 8 B, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 9 F, L, N: yongsu.
- 10 L, S: insert /.
- 11 L, M: insert /. B, P: pa for na, and insert /.
- 12 N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 13 J, P: / for //.
- 14 S, Śikṣ D, P: srungs for srung.
- 15 F, L, M, N: yongsu.
- 16 D, J, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 17 F, L, N, S, Śikṣ D, P: mthun for 'thun.
- 18 F, M, N: yongsu.
- 19 F, M, N: 'gyuro.
- 20 F, N: omit /.
- 21 F, L, M, N: yongsu.
- 22 D, J, N: omit /.
- 23 B, F, N, P: ba for bar.
- 24 D, J: omit /.

gnod pa ji¹ tsam gyi phyir zhugs pa la ltos /² 'od srung^p de lta^q bas na³ dge sbyong gi dri
ma dang /^r dge sbyong gi skyon dang / dge sbyong gi^s mi drang^t ba dang / dge sbyong
gi g-yo dang / dge sbyong gi sgyu dang / dge sbyong gi gya gyu^u nam pa de^v lta⁴ bu de
dag ni^w dge sbyong⁵ bsam pa dag pas yongs su⁶ spang^x bar^y bya'o //z

I. 17 B 156b1, D 156b3, F 208b7, J 169b2, L 173a7, M 213a4, N 269a4, P 152a3, S256a4:
'od srung^a dge sbyong dge sbyong zhes bya ba ni⁷ gang mig nas^b mi zag cing⁸ rna ba
nas ma yin / sna nas ma yin /⁹ lce nas¹⁰ ma yin /¹¹ lus las¹² ma yin¹³ /¹⁴ yid nas kyang
mi zag pa^c ste / de'i phyir dge sbyong dge sbyong zhes bya'o //d skye mched drug rig^e
pa^f dang /¹⁵ mngon par^g shes pa drug dang /^h rjes su¹⁶ dran pa¹⁷ drug dang ldan pa
dangⁱ /^j dam pa mams la gus par^k gnas pa dang / pha rol du¹⁸ 'gro ba'i chos drug la gnas
pa ste / de'i phyir dge sbyong dge sbyong zhes bya'o //l

dge sbyong gi le'u ste dang po'o //m

- 1 B, F, P: *ci* for *ji*.
- 2 B, F, P: // for /.
- 3 B, P: insert /.
- 4 B, P: *dag* for *lta*.
- 5 B, J, P: *slong* for *sbyong*.
- 6 F, N: *yongsu*.
- 7 B, L, P: insert /.
- 8 F cig. F, M, S: insert /.
- 9 B, P: omit /.
- 10 F, M: *las* for *nas*.
- 11 B, P: omit /.
- 12 B: omits *las*. L, N, S: *nas* for *las*. P: *las* and following *ma* a bit small.
- 13 B, F, M, S: insert *la*.
- 14 B, P: omit /.
- 15 D, J: omit /.
- 16 F, L, N: *rjesu*.
- 17 B: *dran pa* repeated at the end of one line and beginning of next. P three spaces here, after *pa*. M:
ba for *pa*.
- 18 B, L, M, P, S: *tu* for *du*.

The Tibetan Text: Chapter Two

II.1 B 156b4, D 156b4, F 209a2, J 169b4, L 173b1, M 213a7, N 269a7, P 152a5, S 256a6:
 //1 'od srung dge slong dge^a slong zhes bya ba ni /2 nyon mongs pa bcom pa'i phyir dge
 slong zhes bya'o //b bdag tu 'du shes pa bcom pa dang / sems can^c du 'du shes pa dang /
 srog tu^d 'du shes pa dang / gso bar 'du shes pa dang / gang zag tu³ 'du shes pa dang /
 skyes par 'du shes pa dang / bud med du 'du shes pa dang / khye'ur^e 'du shes pa dang /
 bu mor 'du shes pa bcom pa ste⁴ /f de'i phyir dge slong dge slong^g zhes bya'o //h lus
 bsgoms paⁱ dang /5 tshul khrims bsgoms pa dang / sems^j bsgoms pa dang / shes rab
 bsgoms pa dang / 'jigs skrag pa med pa dang / srid pa'i chu bo las rgal⁶ ba^k dang /
 'byung ba dang /7 'jig^l pa^m la lta ba dang / 'jigs pa thams cadⁿ dang^o bral ba dang / 'jigs
 pa med^p pa'i lam la gnas pa ste /q de'i phyir dge slong dge slong zhes bya'o //r

II.2 B 156b8, D 156b7, F 209a7, J 169b8, L 173b5, M 213b2, N 269b5, P 152a8, S 256b3:
 'od srung^a gang la la zhig chos 'di dag dang mi⁸ ldan la /9 bdag ni dge slong dge slong
 ngo^b snyam du khas 'che¹⁰ na¹¹ bsam pas^c mos pa^d ma gtogs par¹² nga yang^e de'i ston
 pa ma yin la¹³ de yang^f nga'ig nyan thos ma yin no¹⁴ //h

II.3 B 157a1, D 157a1, F 209a8, J 169b8, L 173b6, M 213b3, N 269b6, P 152b1, S 256b5:
 'od srung^a sdig pa can gyi¹⁵ dge slong dag^b phal cher nga'i bstan pa 'di nub par byed par
 'gyur te / 'od srung^c ya mtshan can¹⁶ dgu bcu rtsa lnga dang¹⁷ / phas kyi¹⁸ rgol ba thams

- 1 B, P: omit //. J: / for //.
- 2 F, J, N, S: omit /.
- 3 B, F, P: *du* for *tu*.
- 4 B, F, P: *dang* for *bcom pa ste*.
- 5 B, P: omit /.
- 6 M, N: *brgal* for *rgal*.
- 7 L, M, N: omit /.
- 8 B: omits *mi*. P: *ma* for *mi*, and *dang ma*, cramped.
- 9 D, J, N: omit /; M: // for /.
- 10 B, P: *che* for *'che*.
- 11 B, F, L, N, P: insert /.
- 12 B, L, P, S: insert /.
- 13 B, F, P, S: insert /. L: *pa* for *la*.
- 14 F, N: *yino*.
- 15 J, P: omit *gyi*. D: *na* of *can* and *gyi* written small, perhaps an original correction before the blocks were carved.
- 16 M, N: omit *can*.
- 17 B: omits *dang*. P: slightly cramped.
- 18 B, P: *kyis* for *kyi*.

cad^d kyis ni¹ nga'i bstan pa 'di^e nub par byed mi^f nus so² // gzhan du na nga'i bstan pa 'di
 las mi^g gti mug pa^h ngesⁱ par mi sems pa gang dag 'byung ba^j de dag gis nga'i bstan^k pa
 nub par^l byed par 'gyur ro³ // 'od srung^m 'di ltaⁿ ste^o dper na⁴ ri dags kyi rgyal^p po seng
 ge^q shi ba'i sha la gcan zan⁵ nam /⁶ bya gang gis kyang za bar mi^f nus kyi /⁷ seng ge'i ro
 de nyid las srin bu gang dag 'byung ba de dag^s ri dags⁸ kyi rgyal po seng ge'i sha la^t za'o
 // 'od srung^u de bzhin du nga'i bstan pa 'di nyid las⁹ mi blun po^v brkam pa^w /¹⁰ chags
 pa'i¹¹ zil gyis non pa /^x chos ma yin pa^y la lta ba / nges par mi sems pa /^z lhod pa /¹²
 brdzun du smra ba¹³ gang dag 'byung ba de dag nga'i^{aa} bstan pa nub par byed par 'gyur
 ro¹⁴ //

II.4 B 157a6, D 157a4, F 209b5, J 170a4, L 174a2, M 213b8, N 270a4, P 152b5, S 257a2:
 'od srung^a chos bzhi dang ldan na¹⁵ sdig pa can gyi dge slong du rig par bya ste / bzhi
 gang zhe na /^b

- 1) chags pa dang /
- 2) zhe sdang dang /^c
- 3) gti mug dang /
- 4) nga'o^d snyam pa'i nga rgyal te /¹⁶

bzhi po de^e dag go^f /

II.5 B 157a7, D 157a4, F 209b6, J 170a5, L 174a2, M 213b8, N 270a5, P 152b6, S 257a3:
 gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1) khengs pa dang /
- 2) mu cor¹⁷ smra ba dang /

- 1 J: omits *ni*. D: *sa* of *kyis*, *ni* and *nga* of *nga'i* cramped.
- 2 F, L, M, N: *nuso*.
- 3 M: space of two letters before 'gyuro. L, N: 'gyuro.
- 4 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 5 D, S: *gzan* for *zan*.
- 6 D, F, J, N: omit /.
- 7 D, J: omit /.
- 8 D, L: *dwags* for *dags*.
- 9 D, J: *la* for *las*.
- 10 F, N: omit /.
- 11 D, J: *pas* for *pa'i*.
- 12 F, M, N: omit /.
- 13 B: *pa* for *ba*. F, M: insert /.
- 14 F, M, N: 'gyuro.
- 15 B, F, M, P: insert /.
- 16 B, L, N, P: omit /.
- 17 D, J: *chor* for *cor*.

3) bya khwa^a lta bu dang /

4) tshig 'chal pa^b ste^c /^d

bzhi po de dag go /

II.6 B 157a8, D 157a5, F 209b7, J 170a5, L 174a3, M 214a1, N 270a6, P 152b6, S 257a4:

gzhan yang bzhi ste /^a bzhi gang zhe na /

1) rgod pa dang /

2) pho theg can dang /

3) rnyed pa 'dod^b pa dang /

4) chos ma yin pa^c 'dod pa ste /¹

bzhi po de dag go /

II.7 B 157a8, D 157a5, F 209b7, J 170a6, L 174a4, M 214a2, N 270a7, P 152b7, S 257a5:

gzhan yang bzhi ste /^a bzhi gang zhe na /

1) g-yon² can dang /

2) sgyu³ can dang /

3) mi 'thun⁴ pas 'tsho ba dang /

4) mi gtsigs⁵ par^b smra ba yin te /^c

bzhi po de dag go^d /

II.8 B 157b1, D 157a6, F 209b8, J 170a7, L 174a4, M 214a3, N 270b1, P 152b8, S 257a6:

gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

1) byas pa mi gzo^a ba dang /

2) byas pa la smod pa dang /

3) sngon byas pa mi dran pa dang /

4) mdza' bo^b la 'khu ba yin te /^c

bzhi po de dag go /^d

II.9 B 157b2, D 157a7, F 210a2, J 170a7, L 174a5, M 214a4, N 270b2, P 152b8, S 257a7:

gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /⁶

1) dad^a pas^b byin pa^c log par ltung^d bar byed pa dang /

¹ B, N, P: omit /.

² D, J, L, N: *g-yo* for *g-yon*.

³ B, P: *sgyun* for *sgyu*.

⁴ J, M, N, S: *mtshun* for *'thun*.

⁵ F, L: *gcig* for *gtsigs*.

⁶ D, J: omit /.

- 2) tshul khrims mi srung ba dang /
- 3) so sor thar pa khyad du gsod pa^e dang /
- 4) 'dul ba mi srung ba^f ste /

bzhi po de dag go /g

II.10 B 157b3, D 157a7, F 210a3, J 170a8, L 174a6, M 214a4, N 270b3, P 153a1, S 257b1:

gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1) bdag tu smra ba yin /¹
- 2) sems can^a du smra ba yin /^b
- 3) srog tu² smra ba yin /
- 4) gang zag tu smra ba yin te /^c

bzhi po de dag go /

II.11 B 157b4, D 157b1, F 210a4, J 170b1, L 174a7, M 214a5, N 270b4, P 153a2, S 257b2:

gzhan yang bzhi ste /^a bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1) sangs rgyas la mi gus pa yin /
- 2) chos la mi gus pa yin /
- 3) dge 'dun la mi gus pa yin /
- 4) bslab^b pa rnams la mi gus pa yin te /

bzhi po de dag go /

II.12 B 157b5, D 157b1, F 210a5, J 170b2, L 174a8, M 214a6, N 270b5, P 153a3, S 257b3:

gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1) dge 'dun 'thun³ pa la^a mi dga' ba yin /
- 2) gtsug lag^b khang la dga' ba^c mi myed pa yin /
- 3) 'du 'dzi la mngon par^d dga' ba yin /
- 4) 'jig rten rgyang^e phan⁴ pa'i^f gsang tshig brjod⁵ pa yin te /g

bzhi po de dag go /

II.13 B 157b6, D 157b2, F 210a6, J 170b3, L 174b1, M 214a8, N 270b6, P 153a4, S 257b4:

gzhan yang^a bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1 B, P [end of line]: omit /.
- 2 B, P: *du* for *tu*.
- 3 N, S: *mtshun* for *'thun*.
- 4 B: *ban* for *phan*. L, M, N: *pan* for *phan*. S: *'phen* for *phan*.
- 5 D, J, M: *rjod* for *brjod*.

- 1) myed pa^b 'dod pa yin /
- 2) grags pa 'dod pa yin /
- 3) gnyen bshes^c 'dod pa yin /
- 4) chos la mchog tu dga' ba mi myed pa yin te /¹

bzhi po de dag go /

II.14 B 157b7, D 157b3, F 210a8, J 170b3, L 174b1, M 214a8, N 270b7, P 153a5, S 257b5:

gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1) bdud kyis zin pa yin /
- 2) bdud kyis non pa yin /
- 3) rmugs^a pa dang^b gnyid^c mang ba yin /
- 4) 'phags pa'i rigs mams la mi^d gnas pa yin te /^e

bzhi po de dag go /

II.15 B 158a1, D 157b4, F 210b1, J 170b4, L 174b2, M 214b2, N 271a2, P 153a6, S 257b6:

gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1) lus rul^a cing brgyan pa dang /
- 2) nyon mongs pas snad² pa dang /
- 3) mya ngan las 'das pa la³ rgyab⁴ kyis bltas⁵ pa dang /
- 4) 'bras bu thob pa med pa yin^b te /^c

bzhi po de dag go /^d

II.16 B 158a2, D 157b4, F 210b2, J 170b5, L 174b3, M 214b3, N 271a3, P 153a7, S 257b7:

gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1) 'dod chags kyis yongs su⁶ gdung bas⁷ yongs su⁸ gdungs pa^a dang /
- 2) zhe sdang gi yongs su⁹ gdung^b bas^c yongs su¹⁰ gdungs pa^d dang /
- 3) gti mug gi yongs su¹¹ gdung bas^e yongs su¹² gdungs pa dang /

1 D, J, N: omit /.

2 B, L: *snang* for *snad*. (P unclear).

3 B, L: omit *la*. See next.

4 P: *la* and following *rgyab* cramped. See previous note.

5 B, L, M: *ltas* for *bltas*. P: *bltas* cramped. F: *pa ltas* for *bltas*.

6 M, N: *yongsu*.

7 F, P: *pas* for *bas*.

8 B, L, M, N: *yongsu*.

9 B, L, M, N: *yongsu*.

10 L, M: *yongsu*.

11 L, M: *yongsu*.

12 L, M, N: *yongsu*.

- 4) nyon mongs pa thams cad^f ky¹ yongs su² gdung³ bas^g yongs su⁴ gdungsh^h
pa ste /

bzhi po de dag go /

II.17 B 158a3, D 157b6, F 210b4, J 170b6, L 174b5, M 214b4, N 217a5, P 153a8, S 258a2:
gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1) lam ngan pa^a la gnas te⁵ 'byung ba mi mthong ba yin /
- 2) ser sna can du gyur^b te⁶ kun mi bged⁷ pa'i⁸ ngang tshul can yin /
- 3) thams cad^c yongs su^d 'dzin par 'dod cing chog mi shes pa yin /^e
- 4) ngoms mi myong zhing thos pa'i nan tan dang bral ba yin te /^f

bzhi po de dag go^g /

II.18 B 158a5, D 157b7, F 210b6, J 170b8, L 174b6, M 214b6, N 271a7, P 153b1, S 258a4:
gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1) mun par gzhol bas^a mun par gyur^b pa^c yin /^d
- 2) rmongs pa la gzhol bas rmongs par gyur pa yin /
- 3) log pa'i^e chos kyis dkris pas^f chos ma yin pa mthong ba yin /
- 4) mya ngan las 'das pa'i sgo bcad^g pas^h 'khor ba'i 'ching⁹ bas¹⁰ bcings pa yin
te /ⁱ

bzhi po de dag go^j /^k

II.19 B 158a7, D 158a1, F 210b8, J 171a1, L 174b8, M 214b7, N 271b2, P 153b3, S 258a6:
gzhan yang bzhi ste / bzhi gang zhe na /

- 1) lus kyⁱ tshul 'chos pa yin /
- 2) ngag gi tshul 'chos pa yin /
- 3) sems kyⁱ tshul 'chos pa yin /
- 4) spyod lam gyi tshul 'chos pa^a yin te /^b

1 B, N, P: *kyis* for *kyi*.

2 B, L, M, N: *yongsu*.

3 B, N: *gdungs* for *gdung*. P: *gtung* for *gdung*. From here to the first *yang* in II.17 P has been corrected.

4 L, M: *yongsu*.

5 B, P: *pa ste* / for *te*.

6 B, F, P: insert /.

7 B: *bgeng* for *bged*. M, N, S: 'gyed for *bged*. F: *dge* for *bged*.

8 B, F, P: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.

9 B, L, P: *bcing* for 'ching. N: *bcings* for 'ching.

10 B, L: *pas* for *bas*.

bzhi po de dag go^c /

II.20 B 158a8, D 158a2, F 211a1, J 171a2, L 174b8, M 214b8, N 271b3, P 153b4, S 258a7:
de la lus kyi tshul 'chos pa ni dal^a gyis 'gro bar tshul 'chos pa yin / mgo smad par tshul
'chos pa yin / gnya^b shing gang tsam du lta bar^c tshul 'chos pa yin / gos tshags¹ legs par
gyon^d par² tshul 'chos^e pa^f yin / dgon pa la gnas pa'i yon tan mi tshol^g bar dgon pa la^h
gnas pa ltar tshul 'chos paⁱ yin / i gong bur 'du shes pa mi sel bar bsod snyoms^k len pa
ltar tshul 'chos pa yin / ngo tsha shes pa dang^l khrel yod pa'i rjes su³ mi 'jug par phyag
dar khrod 'chang ba ltar tshul 'chos pa yin / m rten cing 'brel bar⁴ 'byung ba la mi 'jug par
ri drung dang⁵ shing drung du⁶ gnas pa ltar tshul 'chos pa yin / chos bdud rtsi'i sman mi
tsholⁿ bar bkus^o te⁷ bor ba'i sman tshol ba ltar tshul 'chos pa yin te / p 'di ni lus kyi tshul
'chos pa zhes bya'o //

II.21 B 158b4, D 158a4, F 211a5, J 171a5, L 175a4, M 215a4, N 271b7, P 153b7, S 258b4:
de la ngag gi tshul 'chos pa gang zhe na / che ge mo zhes bya bas^a kho bo shes shing⁸
che ge mo zhes bya bas kho bo mgron⁹ du bos te / kho bos^b gang^c 'dod pa rnyed cing^d
bsti¹⁰ stang^e du byas nas^f rnyed / kho bos bzang^g po rnyed^h / i kho bos lanj mang du
rnyed / kho bos^k mang du thos / l kho bo^m tshul khrims dangⁿ ldan zhing¹¹ dge ba'i chos
can yin / kho bo^o ni bod par 'os^p pa yin / kho bo^q ni slar^r lan gdab pa'i^s 'os^t yin / kho bo^u
ni nus pa dang¹² ldan zhing skal^v ba¹³ yod^w la mthu^x yod pa yin / kho bo^y ni don rnam
par nges pa bstan^z pa la^{aa} mkhas pa yin / gang che ge mo zhes bya^{ab} bas¹⁴ kho bo la 'di
skad ces smras te / kho bos de la 'di^{ac} skad ces¹⁵ smras nas¹⁶ tshar bcad de¹⁷ spobs pa
med par byas / ad kho bos 'khor mgu^{ae} bar byas / kho bos^{af} legs so¹⁸ zhes bya ba thob /

- 1 L, M: *chags* for *tshags*.
- 2 L, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 3 L, M, N: *rjesu*.
- 4 L, M, S: *par* for *bar*. F: *pa* for *bar*.
- 5 F, L: insert /.
- 6 B, P: *na* for *du*.
- 7 B, P: *ste* / for *te*.
- 8 L, S: insert /.
- 9 J, N: *'gron* for *mgron*.
- 10 B, F, P: *sti* for *bsti*.
- 11 B, L, P: insert /.
- 12 B: inserts /. P: space of one letter.
- 13 B, L, N: *pa* for *ba*.
- 14 N: *ba* for *bas*. B, P: insert /.
- 15 L, N: omit *ces*.
- 16 B, M, P: insert /.
- 17 B, M, P: insert /.
- 18 L, M, N: *legso*.

kho bos^{2g} de las¹ bgo² ba thob / yang 'ong bar bya ba'i phyir kho bo^{ah} mgron³ du⁴ gnyer
ces bya ba ste / 'od srung nges par^{ai} mi sems pa'i sems dang ldan pa^{aj} las⁵ tshig 'chal pa^{ak}
de lta bu gang ci 'byung^{al} ba de thams cad^{am} ni ngag^{an} gi tshul 'chos pa ste / mi rigs pa
rnams kyi yin gyi⁶ rigs pa rnams kyi^{ao} ma yin te^{ap} /^{aq} 'di ni ngag^{ar} gi tshul 'chos pa zhes
bya'o //

II.22 B 159a2, D 158b1, F 211b4, J 171b1, L 175b1, M 215b1, N 272a6, P 154a4, S 259a3:
'od srung^a de la sems kyi tshul 'chos^b pa gang^c zhe na / gang sems kyis chos gos^d dang⁷
bsod snyoms rnyed kyang rung bar yongs su⁸ rtog la /⁹ tshig gis bdag la ci yang^e mi
dgos so¹⁰ zhes zer ba dang /^f gang sems kyis rnyed par 'dod la¹¹ 'dod pa nyung ba skad
du smra ba 'di ni sems kyi¹² tshul 'chos^g pa zhes bya'o //

II.23 B 159a4, D 158b2, F 211b6, J 171b3, L 175b2, M 215b3, N 272b1, P 154a6, S 259a4:
de la 'di skad ces bya^a ste /¹³

sams kyis rnyed kyang ci ma rung snyam^b sems //¹⁴
tshig tu bdag la ci yang dgos med smra^c //^d
med pa'i ngo bo'i¹⁵ yid^e kyis de smras te //^f
nam yang^g bde ba^h rnyed par 'gyurⁱ ma yin //^j

sams kyi¹⁶ tshul 'chos^k bsam pas¹⁷ lha^l rnams dang //^m
klu dangⁿ lha mig can rnams slu bar^o byed //^p

- 1 B, F, N: *la* for *las*.
- 2 B: *mgo* for *bgo*. P: *de las* and *ba* of *bgo* written very small, with gap between *las* and *ba* of *bgo*.
- 3 J, N: '*gron* for *mgron*.
- 4 F, L: *tu* for *du*.
- 5 L, M, S: insert /.
- 6 B, F, L, P, S: insert /.
- 7 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 8 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 9 D, J, L: omit /.
- 10 L, M, N: *dgoso*.
- 11 F, M, S: insert /.
- 12 F, N: *kyis* for *kyi*.
- 13 B, P: // for /.
- 14 F, N: / for //.
- 15 F, L: *bo* for *bo'i*.
- 16 M, N: *kyis* for *kyi*.
- 17 F, M: *bas* for *pas*.

smras pa'i sems kyis nams kyang¹ dag^q mi 'gyur //r
 de bzhin gshegs pa kun gyis^s de mkhyen to //t

II.24 B 159a6, D 158b4, F 212a1, J 171b4, L 175b4, M 215b5, N 272b3, P 154a8, S 259a7:
 'od srung^a de ltar na dge slong chos ma yin pa dang ldan pa^b /² sdig pa can rnams kyi
 cho ga^c ma yin pa'i spyod yul la spyod pa 'di lta bu^d gang yin pa 'di ni sems can^e dmyal
 ba dang / dud 'gro'i skye gnas dang / gshin rje^f 'jig rten du 'gro bar 'gyur ba'o^g //h

dge slong gi le'u steⁱ gnyis pa'o //

¹ B, P: *nam yang* for *nams kyang*.
² B, P, S: // for /. D, L: omit /.

The Tibetan Text: Chapter Three

III.1 B 159a8, D158b5, F212a2, J 171b6, L175b5, M215b6, N 272b5, P154b1, S259b2:
 //a 'od srung^b de la dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu gang zhe na / 'od srung 'di lta ste¹ dper na²
 gdol pa ni^c rtag tu^d dur khrod spyod yul pa^e yin te / shi ba la re ba dang / byams pa med
 pa'i mig gis 'gro ba la lta ba dang / shi ba la^f dga' ba yin no^g // 'od srung^h de bzhin du dge
 sbyong gdol pa lta bu yangⁱ rtag tu mdza' bshes^j kyi khyim dang /³ slong ba⁴ ster ba'i
 khyim la gdu⁵ ba^k yin te / de nas^l rnyed pa dang /⁶ bkur stis^m nye bar 'tsho zhingⁿ khyim
 pa de dag chos^o sam /⁷ 'dul ba yang dag par 'dzin du mi 'jug pa dang / de rnyed pa'i ched
 du 'dris par byed kyi⁸ don gyi ched du ma yin pa dang / mdza' ba'i sems med cing rtag tu
 rnyed pa la re^p ba yin te / 'od srung^q 'di ni dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu zhes bya'o //

III.2 B 159b4, D 158b7, F 212a6, J 172a1, L 175b8, M 216a2, N 273a2, P 154b4, S 259b5:
 'od srung^a 'di lta ste⁹ dper na /¹⁰ gdol pa ni^b tshong dpon^c dang / khyim bdag dang /^d
 blon po dang /^e kham^s kyi rgyal po dag dang / bram ze dang / rgyal rigs dang /¹¹ grong
 rdal gyi mi dang /¹² yul gyi mi rnam^s kyis rtag tu yongs su¹³ spang bar^f bya ba'i 'os yin
 te / gdol par^g rig nas thag ring po^h bas kyang ring por yongs su¹⁴ spongⁱ ngo^j // 'od
 srung^k de bzhin du dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu yang¹⁵ dge slong¹⁶ dang /¹⁷ dge slong¹ ma
 dang /^m dge bsnyen dang /¹⁸ dge bsnyen ma tshul khrims dang ldan pa /¹⁹ yon tan dang
 ldan paⁿ rnam^s kyis yongs su²⁰ spang bar^o bya ba'i 'os²¹ yin te / dge sbyong gdol pa^p lta

- 1 M, S: insert /.
- 2 B, F, L, P: insert /.
- 3 F, S: omit /.
- 4 B, P: *slongs mo* for *slong ba*.
- 5 B: *gdul* for *gdu*. P: space of two letters after *gdu*.
- 6 F, J, N: omit /. P: // for /.
- 7 F, M, N: omit /.
- 8 L, N: *kyis* for *kyi*. B, L, P, S: insert /.
- 9 D, J, M, S: insert /.
- 10 D, J, S: omit /.
- 11 B, P: omit /.
- 12 D, J: omit /.
- 13 F: omits *yongs su*. L, N: *yongsu*.
- 14 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 15 S: *bu'ang*. L, M, N: insert /.
- 16 F, M: *sbyong* for *slong*.
- 17 B, F, P: omit /.
- 18 B, P: omit /.
- 19 M: *ba* for *pa*. D, F, J, S: omit /.
- 20 B, F, N, L: *yongsu*.
- 21 B: inserts *pa*. P: space of one letter.

bu¹ sdig pa'i^q chos kun tu² spyod cing tshul khrims 'chal par^r rig nas /³ thag ring po bas
kyang ring por yongs su⁴ spong ngo^s //

III.3 B 159b7, D159a3, F212b2, J 172a4, L176a3, M216a5, N 273a7, P154b7, S260a2:

'od srung^a 'di lta ste⁵ dper na /⁶ gdol pa'i kha phyis sam / gos sam /⁷ yongs su⁸ spyad^b pa
de⁹ thams cad^c la ni^d skye bo ya rabs rnam^{s10} mi reg^e cing yongs su¹¹ mi^f spyod dog //
'od srung^h de bzhin du dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu'i lhungⁱ bzed dam / chos gos sam /
yongs su¹² spyad pa de^j thams cad^k ni mi^l mthun¹³ pa'i^m 'tsho bas yongs su¹⁴ btsal baⁿ /
lus dang^o sems rmas¹⁵ pas yongs su¹⁶ btsal ba^p yin pas¹⁷ tshul khrims dang ldan pa^q /^r
yon tan dang ldan pa^s dag de la mi reg cing mi spyod do //

III.4 B 160a2, D 159a5, F 212b4, J 172a6, L 176a6, M 216a7, N 273b2, P 155a1, S 260a5:

'od srung^a 'di lta ste^b dper na /¹⁸ gdol pa^c ni kha phyis^d thogs te /^e zhum zhum por^f byas
nas¹⁹ gzhan^g gyi khyim du 'gro'o // 'od srung^h de bzhin du dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu
yangⁱ zhum zhum por byas nas / de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten la phyag 'tshal lo²⁰ //
zhum zhum por^j byas nas 'khor gyi nang du 'gro'o //^k zhum zhum por byas nas^l gtsug lag
khang dang / gnas khang dang / gzhan gyi khyim du 'gro'o //^m zhum zhum por byas nasⁿ
'gro ba dang / 'dug pa dang / nyal bar byed do^o // 'od srung^p de ltar na zhum zhum por
byas pa²¹ sdig pa 'chab²² pa de'i spyod lam gang yin^q pa^r de dag²³ thams cad^s ni rung ba

1 F, N: bu'i for bu.

2 D, J: du for tu.

3 D, J: omit /.

4 B, F, L: yongsu.

5 D, J, S: insert /.

6 D, J, S: omit /.

7 B: pa la phyis sam / for pa'i kha phyis sam / gos sam /. P: pa'i kha phyis sam [omitting /] gos
sam very cramped and virtually illegible.

8 B, F, L, M, N: yongsu.

9 F omits de. M, N, S: insert dag after de.

10 D, J: insert /.

11 B, F, L, M, N: yongsu.

12 F, L, M, N: yongsu.

13 B, D, P: 'thun for mthun.

14 F, L, M, N: yongsu.

15 B: smos for rmas. M, N, S: smas for rmas. F, L: smras for rmas.

16 F, L, M, N: yongsu.

17 F, M, N, S: insert /.

18 D, J, S: omit /.

19 B, P: insert //. M, N: insert /.

20 F, M, N: 'tshalo.

21 D, J: insert /. F: omits pa.

22 B, F, P: 'chal for 'chab.

23 D, F, J: omit dag.

ma yin^t pa^u las yongs su¹ brtags^v pa'o //

III.5 B 160a5, D 159a7, F 212b8, J 172b1, L 176b1, M 216b2, N 273b6, P 155a4, S 260b2:
 'od srung^a 'di lta ste² dper na /³ gdol pa'i^b sems ni bde 'gro'i skye ba la mi gnas so⁴ // de
 ci'i phyir zhe na /^c 'di lta de rang gi las kyi nyes pa'i phyir ro⁵ // 'od srung^d de bzhin du
 dge sbyong gdol pa^e lta bu'i sems kyang bde 'gror^f 'gro bar bya ba'i phyir mi^g gnas shing
 /⁶ de'i 'jig rten pha rol mam par zhigs⁷ la /⁸ de^h ngan 'gro gsumⁱ du gnas par⁹ sgrib^j pa¹⁰
 med de^k /¹¹ 'od srung^l 'di ni dge sbyong gdol pa lta bu^m zhes bya'o //

III.6 B 160a8, D 159b1, F 213a1, J 172b2, L 176b2, M 216b5, N 274a2, P 155a6, S 260b4:
 'od srung^a de la dge sbyong rul pa^b gang zhe na / 'od srung^c 'di lta ste^d dper na /¹² rgyal
 po la 'os pa'i btung ba¹³ ro mchog dang ldan pa^e las^f gang snying khu¹⁴ mchog bcus pa
 de'i lha^g ma ni rul cing^g mi gtsang bar gyur pa^h ste /¹⁵ myang bar bya ba ma yin noⁱ //
 'od srung^j de bzhin du dge sbyong¹⁶ rul pa yang^k chos kyi mchog gi snying khuⁱ¹⁷ ro^l
 bro ba dang^m bral baⁿ yin te /¹⁸ dri nga ba dang /¹⁹ yongs su²⁰ spang bar bya ba'i 'os
 yin²¹ / nyon mongs pa dang /²² g-yo sgyu 'dzin pa dang / 'chal baⁱ²³ tshul khirms kyi dri
 mi^o zhim pa^p dang²⁴ ldan zhing 'tshul khirms kyi dri dang bral ba yin / nyon mongs pa'i
 dris bsgos pa yin te /^q de gang dang gang du 'gro ba de dang de nyid du yang^r bdag la

- 1 F, L, N: *yongsu*.
- 2 D, J, S: insert /.
- 3 D, J, S: omit /. M adds / below line.
- 4 L, M, N: *gnaso*. F: *pa'o* for *gnas so*.
- 5 M, N: *phyiro*.
- 6 B, L, P: omit /.
- 7 L, N: *zhig* for *zhigs*.
- 8 F, M, N omit /.
- 9 F, M, S: insert *rig par*.
- 10 B: *par* for *pa*. P: space of one letter after *pa*.
- 11 B, P: // for /.
- 12 D, J, M, S: omit /.
- 13 D, J, P: *ba'i* for *ba*. P: *btung ba'i* rewritten.
- 14 D, J: *khu'i* for *khu*. F, L, N: *ku* for *khu*.
- 15 D, F, J: omit /.
- 16 B, L, P: *slong* for *sbyong*.
- 17 F, L, N: *ku'i* for *khu'i*.
- 18 L, M, S: omit /.
- 19 B, F, P: omit /.
- 20 M, N: *yongsu*.
- 21 F, N, S: insert *te*.
- 22 B, F, P: omit /.
- 23 B, F, L, M, S: *pa'i* for *ba'i*.
- 24 B, L: insert / . P space of one letter.

phan pa'i^s phyir zhugs kyi /¹ gzhan la phan pa'i^t phyir ma yin te / 'od srung^u 'di ni dge sbyong rul pa zhes bya'o //

III.7 B 160b4, D 159b4, F 213a6, J 172b6, L 176b6, M 216b8, N 274a7, P 155b1, S 261a1:
'od srung^a 'di lta ste^b dper na² rul pa^c zhes bya ba ni gang zos pa dang /³ 'thungs^d pa dang / 'chos pa^e gzags^f pa de ni^g rul cing⁴ dri nga ba^h yinⁱ te / skye bo ya^j rabs thams cad kyis yongs su⁵ spang bar^k bya baⁱ 'os yin no⁶ // 'od srung^l de bzhin du dge sbyong rul pa^m yangⁿ gzags pa dang^o mtshungs te / lus dang^p ngag dang⁷ sems kyi kun tu^q spyod pa yongs su⁸ ma dag pas⁹ 'phags paⁱ skye bos^r yongs su¹⁰ spang bar bya ba yin te /^s 'di ni dge sbyong rul pa zhes^t bya'o //

III.8 B 160b6, D 159b5, F 213a8, J 172b8, L 176b7, M 217a3, N 274b2, P 155b3, S 261a4:
'od srung^a 'di lta ste /¹¹ dper na /¹² sa bon rul pa^b gang yin pa de ni^c sa chen po las skyer^d mi rung ngo // 'od srung^e de bzhin du dge sbyong^f rul pa^g yang¹³ sangs rgyas kyi bstan pa 'di la mi skye zhing /¹⁴ 'phags paⁱ chos rnam par^h grol baⁱ sa bon nus pa ma yinⁱ la /¹⁵ 'bras bu thob par mi 'gyur te / 'od srung^j 'di ni dge sbyong rul pa¹⁶ zhes bya'o //

III.9 B 160b8, D 159b7, F 213b2, J 173a1, L 177a1, M 217a4, N 274b4, P 155b5, S 261a5:
'od srung^a de la dge sbyong za ma tog^b lta bu gang zhe na / 'od srung^c 'di lta ste^d dper na /¹⁷ za ma tog^e phyi rol shin tuf^f byi dor byas la /¹⁸ nang mi gtsang ba sna tshogs kyis gang ba zhi^g yod pa de bzhin du /¹⁹ dge sbyong²⁰ za ma tog^g lta bu yang^h dge sbyong lta^r bcos shing phyiⁱ rol gtsang sbra^j spyod par gyur^k la / nang 'dod chags dang /¹ zhe

- 1 D, J, L: omit /.
- 2 F, L, M, N: insert /.
- 3 D, F: omit /.
- 4 D, J, S: *zhing* for *cing*.
- 5 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 6 F, M, N: *yino*.
- 7 L, S: insert /.
- 8 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 9 F, M, N: insert /.
- 10 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 11 B, F, L, P: omit /.
- 12 D, J, S: omit /.
- 13 F: *yan* for *yang*. M, N: insert /. N: *dang* for *yang*. S: *pa'ang* for *pa yang*.
- 14 B, D, J, P: omit /.
- 15 D, F, J: omit /.
- 16 M, S: *ba* for *pa*.
- 17 D, J, S: omit /.
- 18 D, F, J, S: omit /.
- 19 D, J, M, N: omit /. D, J, L, S: insert '*od srung*'. (S: *srungs* for *srung*).
- 20 F, M, N: *slong* for *sbyong*.

bcos shing phyiⁱ rol gtsang sbrai spyod par gyur^k la / nang 'dod chags dang /¹ zhe sdang
dang /² gti mug gis^l yongs su³ gang ba yin te / 'od srung^m 'di ni dge sbyong za ma togⁿ
lta bu zhes bya'o //

III. 10 B 161a2, D 160a1, F 213b4, J 173a3, L 177a3, M 217a6, N 274b7, P 155b7, S 261b1:
'od srung^a de la dge sbyong ku^b ran da⁴ ka lta bu gang zhe na / 'od srung^c 'di lta ste⁵
dper na /⁶ ku ran da⁷ ka^d zhes bya ba'i me tog ni kha dog⁸ blta⁹ na sdug^e la^f reg na
rtsub¹⁰ pa^g lei ba'i^h sbrang ma'i dri mnamⁱ zhing^j shik^k la bar¹¹ ka'i rtsa ba'i dri mnam¹²
ste / mkhas pa mdzangs¹³ pa mams ni me tog de lta bu la mi reg¹⁴ mi len mi^l snom¹⁵ gyi
/¹⁶ gang dag byis pa'i rang bzhin can du gyur pa de'i skyon mi shes pa¹⁷ de dag ni me
tog de lta bu len cing snom¹⁸ mo¹⁹ //m 'od srungⁿ de bzhin du dge sbyong²⁰ ku ran da²¹
ka lta bu^o yang^p dge sbyong²² gi kha dog dang /²³ gzugs dang ldan par gyur kyang²⁴ mi
des²⁵ pa yin / tshig brlang ba^q yin / 'chal pa'i tshul khirms kyi dri mi^r zhim pa yin / 'tsho
ba nyams pa yin / spyod pa nyams pa yin / lta ba nyams^s pa yin te / mdzangs²⁶ pa mkhas
pa mams^t ni ku^u ran da²⁷ ka lta bu'i dge sbyong de lta bu la sten²⁸ pa 'am / snyen²⁹ pa
'am / bsnyen bkur mi byed kyi /¹ de'i tshul rig pas thag ring po^v bas^w kyang ring^x por

- 1 B, P: omit /.
- 2 B, P: *de la* // for *dang* /.
- 3 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 4 D, J: *raṇ ḍā* for *ran da*.
- 5 N, S: insert /.
- 6 D, J, S: omit /.
- 7 D, J: *raṇ ḍā* for *ran da*.
- 8 B, P: *tog* for *dog*, and insert *ni*.
- 9 B, P: *lta* for *blta*.
- 10 B: *rtsab* for *rtsub*. F: *rtsubs* for *rtsub*. P: small, but seems to be *rtsub*.
- 11 B: *le barta* for *la bar*. P: *le ba rta* for *la bar*.
- 12 B, P: *ma nam* for *mnam*.
- 13 F, J, L: *'dzangs* for *mdzangs*.
- 14 D, J: insert /.
- 15 B: *gnom* for *snom*. J, P: *bsnom* for *snom* [P with space between *bsno* and *ma*].
- 16 B, P: omit /.
- 17 D, J: insert /.
- 18 J, P: *bsnom*, [P with *nga* of *cing* and *ba* of *bsnom* cramped]. D: one letter space between *cing* and *snom*.
- 19 F, M: *snomo*.
- 20 B, F, P: *slong* for *sbyong*.
- 21 D, J: *raṇ ḍā* for *ran da*.
- 22 B, P: *slong* for *sbyong*.
- 23 B, F, L, P, S: omit /.
- 24 B, L: insert /. P: one letter space.
- 25 B, F, S: *nges* for *des*.
- 26 B, F, J, L, P: *'dzangs* for *mdzangs*.
- 27 D, J: *raṇ ḍā* for *ran da*.
- 28 L, M: *bsten* for *sten*. F: *rten* for *sten*. N: *ston* for *sten*.
- 29 B, M, N, P: *bsnyen* for *snyen*. F: *gnyen* for *snyen*. L: *snyems* for *snyen*.

bsnyen bkur mi byed kyi /¹ de'i tshul rig pas thag ring po^v bas^w kyang ring^x por yongs
su² spong ngo // gang dag byis pa'i rang bzhin can^y du gyur pa³ de dag ni ku ran da⁴ ka
lta bu'i dge sbyong de lta^z bu^{aa} la sten⁵ cing snyen⁶ la^{ab} bsnyen^{ac} bkur byed de^{ad} /ae ku
ran^{af} da⁷ ka'i me tog byis pa'i lag na 'dug pa bzhin du⁸ de dang 'thun⁹ pa nyid du 'gyur te
/ag 'od srung^{ah} 'di ni ku ran da¹⁰ ka lta bu'i dge sbyong zhes bya'o //

III. 11 B 161b1, D 160a5, F 214a2, J 173a8, L 177a8, M 217b4, N 275a7, P 156a4, S 261b7:
'od srung^a de la chom rkun¹¹ lta bu'i^b dge sbyong gang zhe na /c 'od srung^d 'di lta ste^e
dper na /f mi g-yon¹² can gyi rang bzhin can¹³ rtag tu brkam pa¹⁴ / chags pa'i zil gyis
non pa /g bdag gi¹⁵ myed pas chog par^h mi 'dzin paⁱ / gzhan gyi nor la re ba /¹⁶ drag shul
can /j dbyug pa dang /¹⁷ mtshon cha dang /¹⁸ dgra cha^k thogs^l pa /m ngo tshaⁿ med pa /
snying rje med pa / rtag tu gdug^o cing^p rab tu gdug^q pa'i sems dang ldan pa^r ni /¹⁹ de
gang gi tshe²⁰ grong bar^s ram^t / grong ngam²¹ /²² grong khyer ram / grong rdal lam²³ /u
yul du 'jug pa deⁱv tshe²⁴ de 'di^w snyam du^x gzhan dag gi^y nor gyi phung^z po gang yin
pa de bdag gir^{aa} gyur^{ab} na²⁵ re stes^{ac} snyam du sems shing /²⁶ de zin du 'ong^{ad} zhes^{ae}
mkhyun bu²⁷ mkhyun bur rgyu²⁸ ba yin no²⁹ // 'od srung³⁰ de bzhin du chom rkun^{af} lta
bu'i dge sbyong yang rtag tu brkam pa / chags pa'i zil gyis non^{ag} pa /¹ bdag gi^{ah} myed^{ai}

- 1 F, L: omit /.
- 2 F, L, M: : *yongsu*.
- 3 B, P: insert /.
- 4 D, J: *raṇ dā* for *ran da*.
- 5 B, P: *bsten* for *sten*. F: *rtēn* for *sten*. L: *bsnyen* for *sten*.
- 6 F, L: *bsnyen* for *snyen*.
- 7 D, J: *raṇ dā* for *ran da*.
- 8 M, N: insert /.
- 9 L, S: *mtshun* for *'thun*.
- 10 D, J: *raṇ dā* for *ran da*.
- 11 B: *chos kun* for *chom rkun*. P: probably corrected.
- 12 D, J: *g-yo* for *g-yon*. F: *yon* for *g-yon*.
- 13 D, J: insert /.
- 14 F, M: *ba* for *pa*. F: inserts *dang* after *ba*.
- 15 B, P: *gis* for *gi*.
- 16 F, L, M, N: omit /.
- 17 B, F, P: omit /.
- 18 D, J, L: omit /.
- 19 D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 20 M, N: insert /.
- 21 B, P: *'am* for *ngam*. F: *nga* written below line.
- 22 M, S: omit *grong ngam* /. F // for /.
- 23 B: *'am* for *lam*. P space between *la* and *ma*.
- 24 M, N: insert / . F: inserts //.
- 25 L, M, N: insert / . F: inserts //.
- 26 D, J: omit /.
- 27 B, F, P: omit *mkhyun bu*. P: space of four letters.
- 28 D: *mkhyun bu mkhyun bur rgyu* cramped. S: *bu mkhyun bur rgyu* very cramped; if *bu mkhyun*

dge sbyong yang rtag tu brkam pa / chags pa'i zil gyis non^{ag} pa /¹ bdag gi^{ah} myed^{ai} pas
 chog^{aj} mi shes pa /^{ak} gzhan gyi myed^{al} ba² la re^{am} ba yin te /^{an} de gang gi tshe³ grong
 bar^{ao} ram /^{ap} grong ngam⁴ / grong khyer ram^{aq} / grong rdal lam^{ar} / yul du 'jug pa de^{ias}
 tshe /^{at} de myed^{au} pa'i phyir 'jug gi⁵ chos kyi phyir ma yin te /^{av} spyod lam thams cad^{aw}
 kyang chom rkun⁶ lta bur ston pa^{ax} yin^{ay} /^{az} 'chab cing sbad^{ba} pa yin te /^{bb} bdag dge^{bc}
 slong gzhan gyis tshul khirms 'chal par shes na mi rung ste /^{bd} shes par gyur^{be} na⁷ so
 sor thar pa'i mdo^{bf} 'don pa las bskrad^{bg} par 'gyur ro⁸ snyam nas⁹ rtag tu skrag cing^{bh}
 rtag tu^{bi} 'jigs^{bj} te / spyod lam thams cad^{bk} kyang g-yos spyod pas /¹⁰ lha dang¹¹ klu^{bl}
 dang /¹² gnod sbyin dang /¹³ dri za dag gis chom rkun¹⁴ 'ong ngo^{bm} // chom rkun^{bn}
 'gro'o // chom rkun^{bo} 'greng^{bp} ngo^{bq} //^{br} chom rkun^{bs} 'chag^{bt} go¹⁵ /^{bu} chom rkun 'dug
 go¹⁶ /^{bv} nyal lo¹⁷ //¹⁸ chos gos len to //^{bw} chom rkun^{bx} grong du 'gro'o // grong nas
 'byung ngo //^{by} chom rkun^{bz} za'o //^{ca} chom rkun^{cb} 'thung ngo^{cc} //^{cd} chom rkun skra
 'dreg^{ce} go¹⁹ zhes rig par 'gyur ro²⁰ //

III. 12 B 162a3, D 160b4, F 214b3, J 173b7, L 177b8, M 218a4, N 276a3, P 156b4, S 262a2:
 'od srung^a de ltar na²¹ lha dang /²² klu dang /²³ gnod sbyin^b dang /²⁴ dri za rnams kyi s
 de'i spyod lam gang yin pa^c de thams cad rung ba ma yin la^d /¹ yongs su² brtags^e pa³

were omitted, things would fit perfectly.

- 29 M, N: *yino*.
- 30 F, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 1 F: // for /. M, N: omit /.
- 2 B, L, S: *pa* for *ba*.
- 3 M, N: insert /.
- 4 B, P: *'am* for *ngam*.
- 5 F: *go* for *gi*. L, M, N, S: insert /. F: inserts //.
- 6 B, P: *kun* for *rkun*.
- 7 L, M, N: insert /.
- 8 L, M, N: *'gyuro*. F, M, N: insert //. J: *re* for *ro* (broken?).
- 9 B, L, P: insert /.
- 10 L, M, N: omit /.
- 11 D, J, L, S: insert /.
- 12 B, F, P: omit /.
- 13 B, P: omit /. F // for /.
- 14 B, F: *rkum* for *rkun*.
- 15 L, N: *'chago*.
- 16 M, N: *'dugo*.
- 17 F, N: *nyalo*.
- 18 B, J, M, P: / for //. N: omits //.
- 19 B, P: insert /.
- 20 F, M, N: *'gyuro*. P: adds one /, then space of nine letters before //.
- 21 B, L, P: insert /. F: inserts //.
- 22 B, F, L, P: omit /.
- 23 B, P: omit /.
- 24 B, P: omit /.

spyod lam gang yin pa^c de thams cad rung ba ma yin la^d /¹ yongs su² brtags^e pa³ yin
 par rig par 'gyur te /^f rig nas kyang de la snying rje chen po skyed cing /⁴ kye ma 'di
 mtshar cig⁵ sdig pa can gyi dge slong 'di lta bu dag gis⁶ bcom ldan 'das^g shākya⁷ thub
 pa'i bstan⁸ pa nub par byed par 'gyur⁹ zhes 'phyā zhing mi^h snyan parⁱ zer ro¹⁰ // tshul
 khrims dang ldan pa^{11j} yon tan dang¹² ldan pa^k mams la ni^l lha dang¹³ klu dang /¹⁴
 gnod sbyin dang^m /ⁿ dri za^o mams¹⁵ kyang^p 'di dag ni bstan^q pa yongs su¹⁶ 'dzin pa'o^r
 zhes^s gus pa^t cher skyed¹⁷ do^u // 'od srung^v chom rkun¹⁸ lta bu'i dge sbyong bstan^w pa
 'di la rab^x tu byung ba ni skyo ba^y dang /¹⁹ 'dod chags dang²⁰ bral ba'i sems gcig kyang
 mi^z skyed^{aa} na^{ab} /²¹ 'bras bu thob²² pa lta^{ac} ci smos kyi²³ /²⁴ de ni gnas^{ad} med^{ae} do^{af} //²⁵
 'od srung²⁶ 'di ni chom rkun lta bu'i dge^{ag} sbyong zhes bya'o //

III. 13 B 162a7, D 160b7, F 214b8, J 174a3, L 178a4, M 218a8, N 276b2, P 156b8, S 262b7:

a 'od srung^b de la^c dge sbyong²⁷ shin te ma gang zhe na / 'od srung^d 'di lta ste²⁸ dper na
 /²⁹ 'bru'i nang na gang dag ma smin^e pa dang / mi grung ba dang / 'ongs^f med cing 'bru
 'dra ba de dag ni^g shin te ma zhes bya'o // 'od srung^h de bzhin du dge sbyongⁱ shin te ma

- 1 B, L, P: omit /. F // for /..
- 2 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 3 M, S: insert *ma*.
- 4 D, J: omit /. F // for /.
- 5 L: *cing* for *cig*. B, L, P: insert /.
- 6 F: *gi* for *gis*. B, F, P, S: insert /.
- 7 B, P: *shag kya* for *shākya*.
- 8 B, P: *stan* for *bstan*. F: *riten* for *bstan*.
- 9 B, F, L, M, P: insert *ro* //. P adds space of two letters instead of //. M: *'gyuro*.
- 10 B, F, L: *zero*.
- 11 D, J, N, S: insert /.
- 12 B, P: omit *dang*.
- 13 D, J, S: insert /.
- 14 B, F, L, P: omit /.
- 15 D, J, P: insert *kyis*. P: *rnams kyis* written very small and cramped. Written without *kyis rnams* would fit normally in the space.
- 16 L, N: *yongsu*.
- 17 M, N: *bskyed* for *skyed*. D, J, L: *chen po byed* for *cher skyed*.
- 18 D, J, P: insert *pa*. (P seems to add it in the margin?)
- 19 B, P, S: omit /.
- 20 B, P: insert /.
- 21 D, J: omit /.
- 22 M, N, S: *'thob* for *thob*.
- 23 F, M, N: *kyis* for *kyi*.
- 24 D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 25 B, N: *de /* for *do* //. P: / for //.
- 26 F, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 27 D, J: *slong* for *sbyong*.
- 28 D, J, S: insert /.
- 29 D, J, S: omit /.

ba de dag ni^g shin te ma zhes bya'o // 'od srung^h de bzhin du dge sbyong¹ shin te ma yang² yang zhing mthu chung laiⁱ bdud kyis zin pa^j /^k bdud kyis^l non pa /³ nyon mongs pa thams cad^m kyis 'phrogsⁿ pa⁴ / rlung gis g-yengs^o pa lta bu ste^p /^q 'od srung^r dge sbyong shin te ma zhes bya ba de ni⁵ dge slong^s tshul khirms 'chal^t pa⁶ sdig pa can rnams kyī tshig bla dags^u te /^v de dag ni^w ngas^x dge sbyong shin te ma zhes btags so⁷ //

III. 14 A 382a1, B 162b2, D 161a3, F 215a3, J 174a6, L 178a7, M 218b3, N 276b5, P 157a2, S 263a3:

'od srung^a de la^b dge sbyong sun par byed pa gang zhe na /^c 'od srung^d 'di lta ste⁸ dper na /⁹ nas kyī ljang bu phun sum tshogs pa'i nang na /¹⁰ nas^e la gnod pa zhiḡ skyes nas /¹¹ de ljang bu'i kha dog 'dra^f zhing rtags^g dang dbyibs kyang 'dra bas /¹² de la nas kyī^h bdag po de dag 'di snyam du 'di dag thams cadⁱ ni nas yin no¹³ snyam pa'i^j 'du shes skyed skyed^k pa las /¹⁴ gang gi tshe¹⁵ nas kyī ljang^l bu las snye ma^m byung bar gyurⁿ pa^o de'i tshe /¹⁶ nas la gnod pa de la^p nas kyī 'du shes mi 'byung ngo^q // 'od srung¹⁷ de bzhin du dge sbyong sun par¹⁸ byed pa'i dge slong¹⁹ dge slong gi dge 'dun gyi nang na 'dug pa yang²⁰ tshul khirms dang ldan pa^r /^s yon tan dang ldan pa^t /^u sbyin pa'i^v gnas su²¹ gyur pa rnams^w dang /²² kha dog dang rtags kyī dbyibs^x 'dra^y bas /²³ de la sbyin pa^z po dang /^{aa} sbyin bdag^{ab} de dag^{ac} dge sbyong^{ad} ngo¹ snyam pa'i 'du shes skyed^{ae}

- 1 B, P: *slong* for *sbyong*.
- 2 S: *ma'ang* for *ma yang*. B, L, M, N, P: insert /.
- 3 F // . D, J, P: insert *nyon mongs pa thams cad kyis non pa* /. P: very cramped, and probably originally omitted the phrase (see below).
- 4 N: *la* for *pa*. P: *bud kyis non pa* / *nyon mongs pa thams cad kyis non pa* / *nyon mongs pa thams cad kyis 'phrogs pa* very cramped. If *nyon mongs pa thams cad kyis non pa* / were omitted (as in B and others), it would fit perfectly.
- 5 L, M, N: insert /.
- 6 M, N: insert /.
- 7 F, L, M, N: *btags*.
- 8 D, J, S: insert /.
- 9 D, J, S: omit /. F: inserts *de*.
- 10 D, J: omit /. F //.
- 11 D, J: omit /. F //.
- 12 D, J: omit /. F //.
- 13 M, N: *yino*. B, F: insert // . P: two letter space between *no* and *snyam*.
- 14 D, J: omit /.
- 15 D, J, P: insert *na*. P: *na* and following *nas* cramped.
- 16 D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 17 F, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 18 L, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 19 B, M, N, S: insert / . P: space of one letter.
- 20 S: *pa'ang*. B, P: insert /.
- 21 L, M: *gnasu*.
- 22 D, F, J: omit /.
- 23 D, F, J: omit /.

dang /^{aa} sbyin bdag^{ab} de dag^{ac} dge sbyong^{ad} ngo¹ snyam pa'i 'du shes skyed^{ae} cing /²
 sbyin gnas su³ 'du shes^{af} bskyed⁴ pa las /⁵ de nas gal te^{ag} mi gti^{ah} mug pa⁶ dge sbyong
 ma yin⁷ la /⁸ dge sbyong du khas 'che ba /^{ai} tshangs par spyod pa ma yin la^{aj} /⁹ tshangs
 par spyod par khas^{ak} 'che ba¹⁰ /^{al} nang rul cing^{am} zag pa de 'khor gyi nang nas^{an} byung
 ste /^{ao} shi 'phos shing 'chi ba'i dus byas¹¹ nas¹² sems can dmyal¹³ bar^{ap} 'gro bar 'gyur te
 / lha dang /¹⁴ klu dang /¹⁵ gnod sbyin dang /¹⁶ dri za^{aq} lha'i mig¹⁷ dang^{ar} ldan pa¹⁸ mams
 kyis¹⁹ de sems can^{as} dmyal bar skyes^{at} par mthong ste /^{au} mthong nas kyang mi²⁰ gti
 mug pa 'di ni^{av} sngon^{aw} dge sbyong gi kha dog dang²¹ gzugs kyis sdig pa'i las byas pas
 /²² de sems can^{ax} dmyal ba chen por skyes te /^{ay} nas la^{az} gnod pa la nas^{ba} kyi yon tan
 med^{bb} pa ltar²³ 'di la yang^{bc} dge sbyong gi yon tan gyi 'bras bu med^{bd} do^{be} /²⁴ zhes
 snying rje chen po skyed^{bf} de^{bg} / 'od srung^{bh} 'di ni dge sbyong sun^{bi} par^{bj} byed pa zhes
 bya'o //

III.15 A 382a2, B 163a3, D 161b2, F 215b3, J 174b4, L 178b6, M 219a3, N 277b1, P 157b2, S 263b4:

'od srung²⁵ de la dge sbyong ltar bcos^a pa gang zhe na /^b 'od srung²⁶ 'di lta ste^c dper na
 /²⁷ ra gan chen po zhes bya ba'i lcags shig¹ yod de^d /^e shin^f tu^g yongs su² sbyang^h ba

- 1 B: inserts //. P: space of one letter. D: space of one or two letters, at end of line.
- 2 D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 3 F, L, M: *gnasu*.
- 4 F, S: *skyed* for *bskyed*.
- 5 D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 6 M, N: insert /.
- 7 D, J: insert *pa*.
- 8 D, F, J, L: omit /.
- 9 D, F, J: omit /.
- 10 B, P: *bas* for *ba*.
- 11 P, S: insert /.
- 12 F: inserts //. B, L, N: insert /.
- 13 A: Folio 82a1 begins here.
- 14 B, F, L, N, P: omit /.
- 15 B, F, J, P: omit /.
- 16 B, P: omit /.
- 17 A, F: *myig* for *mig*.
- 18 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 19 B, L, M, N, P: insert /. F: inserts //.
- 20 A: *myi* for *mi*. M, N: omit *mi*.
- 21 A, M, N: insert /.
- 22 A, L, M, N: omit /. F //.
- 23 B, L, P, S: insert /.
- 24 A, M, S: omit //. J, L: / for //.
- 25 N, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 26 F, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 27 D, J, S: omit /. F: // for /.

ra gan chen po zhes bya ba'i lcags shig¹ yod de^d /e^e shin^f tu^g yongs su² sbyang^h ba byas
 shing /³ shinⁱ tu^j yongs su⁴ dag par byas na /⁵ gser 'dra bar 'gyur te / 'on^k kyang gser gyi
 rin thang^l dang /⁶ gser gyi kha dog dang /⁷ bdar^m 'phro dang /ⁿ srang la gzhal⁸ ba'i^o lcid⁹
 'dra ba ni ma yin no^p // 'od srung¹⁰ de bzhin du dge sbyong ltar bcos^q ba'i¹¹ dge
 sbyong¹² yang lus shin^r tu^s bkru shing^t gos bzang po mdzes pa gyon^u la /^v dge
 sbyong¹³ gi^w phyi rol gyi^x spyod pa thams cad^y yongs su¹⁴ dag ste /¹⁵ 'gro ba dang /¹⁶
 'ong ba dang /¹⁷ mdun du^z lta ba dang /^{aa} g-ya' g-yor¹⁸ lta ba dang /¹⁹ bskum^{ab} pa²⁰ dang
 /²¹ brkyang ba^{ac} dang /²² chos gos snam^{ad} sbyar dang /²³ lhung bzed dang / chos gos
 'dzin^{ae} pa^{af} shes bzhin du spyod kyang /²⁴ de 'dod chags kyis bcom pa²⁵ dang / zhe
 sdang gis bcom pa²⁶ dang / gti mug gis bcom pa²⁷ dang / nyon mongs pas bcom pa²⁸
 dang / rnyed pa dang²⁹ bkur stis^{ag} bcom pa³⁰ dang / nga rgyal dang /³¹ che ba'i nga rgyal
 dang / nga rgyal las kyang nga rgyal dang / nga 'o snyam pa'i³² nga^{ah} rgyal dang /ai

- 1 A: *zhig* for *shig*. F: *lcag zhig* for *lcags shig*.
- 2 L, N: *yongsu*.
- 3 A, D, J, L: omit /. F: // for /.
- 4 L, N: *yongsu*.
- 5 D, J, S: omit /.
- 6 B, L, P: omit /. F: // for /.
- 7 B, F, L, P: omit /.
- 8 D, J: *gcal* for *gzhal*.
- 9 F, L, M, N, S: *ljid* for *lcid*. B: *lcing* for *lcid*.
- 10 F, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 11 A, B, F, L, M, S: *pa'i* for *ba'i*.
- 12 F, M, N: *slong* for *sbyong*.
- 13 F, M, N: *slong* for *sbyong*.
- 14 L, N: *yongsu*.
- 15 A, M: omit /.
- 16 B, P: omit /.
- 17 D, J: omit /. M space of two letters before /.
- 18 D, J, P: *g-yas g-yon* for *g-ya' g-yor*. F: *g-ya' yor* for *g-ya' g-yor*.
- 19 D, J: omit /.
- 20 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 21 B, D, J, P: omit /.
- 22 D, J: omit /.
- 23 D, J: omit /.
- 24 A, B, D, J, P: omit /.
- 25 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 26 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 27 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 28 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 29 A, M, N: insert /.
- 30 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 31 B, P: omit /. F //.
- 32 A, M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.

mngon pa'i¹ nga rgyal dang /^{aj} cung² zad snyam pa'i³ nga rgyal dang / log pa'i nga rgyal
 gyis^{ak} bcom pa⁴ dang /^{al} nyon mongs pas 'khol^{am} ba^{an} dang / bsnyen bkur lhur len^{ao}
 gyi⁵ chos lhur mi^{ap} len^{aq} pa dang / lus cha⁶ bar⁷ sbyor ba la brtson gyi /⁸ tshul khirms
 kyis⁹ cha¹⁰ bar sbyor ba la mi^{ar} brtson pa¹¹ dang /^{as} zas dang gos lhur len^{at} gyi¹² 'phags
 pa'i chos lhur mi^{au} len pa^{av} dang /^{aw} 'jig rten pha rol^{ax} du¹³ kha na ma^{ay} tho bas 'jigs^{az}
 par mi^{ba} lta ba dang /^{bb} tshe 'di lhur len^{bc} gyi¹⁴ tshe^{bd} phyi ma lhur mi^{be} len^{bf} pa dang
 /^{bg} lus^{bh} gso pa¹⁵ dang / rnyed pa dang /¹⁶ bkur sti^{bi} dang^{bj} /¹⁷ grags^{bk} pa la^{bl} rten gyi
 /¹⁸ chos la rim^{bm} gror^{bn} bya ba la mi^{bo} rten^{bp} pa dang / sbag¹⁹ pa sna^{bq} tshogs kyis
 sbags²⁰ pa dang / sdig^{br} pas^{bs} bsgos^{bt} pa dang / khyim gyi las ky^{bu} mtha' la^{bv} mngon
 par²¹ brtson pa²² dang / khyim pa dang^{bw} mtshungs pa'i sems dang ldan pas²³ bde ba
 dag gis kyang²⁴ bde zhing²⁵ sdug bsngal^{bx} dag gis kyang sdug bsngal ba dang / rjes
 su^{by} chags pa dang²⁶ khong khro bas bcom pa^{bz} yin te /^{ca} de'i dge sbyong gi chos²⁷
 dang /²⁸ spyod lam thams cad^{cb} dang /²⁹ sems dang sems las byung ba'i chos thams
 cad^{cc} ni sems can^{cd} dmyal ba dang /^{ce} dud 'gro'i^{cf} skye gnas dang / gshin rje'i^{cg} 'jig rten
 du gzhol ba yin zhing¹ / de² dge sbyong gi^{ch} rin thang dang /³ ri ba dang / dge sbyong gi

- 1 A, M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 2 A, B, L: *chung* for *cung*.
- 3 A, M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 4 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 5 A, F: *kyi* for *gyi*. S: inserts /.
- 6 B, P: *che* for *cha*. F: *chu ra* for *cha*.
- 7 D, N, P: *par* for *bar*.
- 8 D, J, L: omit /.
- 9 B, N, P: *kyi* for *kyis*.
- 10 B, P: *che* for *cha*.
- 11 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 12 A: *kyi* for *gyi*. F: *kyis* for *gyi*. M, N, S: insert /.
- 13 A, B, F, L, P, S: *tu* for *du*.
- 14 A, J: *kyi* for *gyi*. M, N, S: insert /.
- 15 A, B, F, L, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 16 B, F, P: omit /.
- 17 B, P: omit /.
- 18 D, F, J, L: omit /.
- 19 B, N, P: *sbags* for *sbag*.
- 20 D, J: *sbag* for *sbags*.
- 21 A, J, L, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 22 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 23 A, M: *bas* for *pas*. M, N, S: insert /.
- 24 B, P: insert /.
- 25 A, S: insert /.
- 26 A, B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 27 D, N: *cho ga* for *chos*.
- 28 B, L, P: omit /.
- 29 D, J: omit /.

P //.

ba yin zhing¹ / de² dge sbyong gi^{ch} rin thang dang /³ ri ba dang / dge sbyong gi srang^{ci}
kha^{cj} dang⁴ mi^{ck} mnyam pa⁵ ste /⁶ 'od srung^{cl} 'di ni dge sbyong⁷ ltar bcos^{cm} pa zhes
bya'o //

III. 16 A 382a10, B 163b7, D 162a3, F 216a7, J 175a5, L 179a7, M 219b6, N 278a7, P 158a4, S
264b2:

'od srung^a de la ji⁸ ltar na⁹ dge slong¹⁰ gzi^b 'phrogs pa yin zhe na /^c 'od^d srung^e 'di lta
ste^f dper na /¹¹ skyes pa 'am /¹² bud med^g dam /^h khye'u 'am /¹³ buⁱ mo gang la la zhig
mi^j ma yin pas¹⁴ gzi¹⁵ phrogs¹⁶ par gyur^k na /^l de dbang chung bar grags^m shing¹⁷
mdogⁿ ngan la¹⁸ mi^o sdug par¹⁹ 'gyur te^p /^q de ltar²⁰ mdangs^r phrogs^s pa mams la ni
sman tam^t /^u gsang sngags^v sam / rig sngags mams kyis^w mi^x slon^y te^z /^{aa} de 'chi bar
'gyur ba^{ab} ma gtogs par tha²¹ mar gzhan du mi^{ac} 'gyur ro²² //ad 'od srung²³ de bzhin du
dge slong^{ae} gang la²⁴ tshul^{af} khrims kyi gzi^{ag} med^{ah} pa dang / ting nge²⁵ 'dzin gyi^{ai} gzi
med^{aj} pa dang /^{ak} shes rab kyi gzi med^{al} pa dang / nam par^{am} grol ba^{an} gzi med^{ao} pa
dang / nam par^{ap} grol baⁱ ye shes mthong baⁱ gzi med^{aq} pa dang /^{ar} byams paⁱ gzi med
pa^{as} dang / snying rjeⁱ gzi med^{at} pa dang / dgaⁱ baⁱ gzi med^{au} pa dang / btang snyoms
kyi gzi med^{av} pa dang /^{aw} sbyin pa²⁶ dang²⁷ yang dag par sdom pa^{ax} dang /^{ay} des paⁱ
gzi med^{az} pa dang / dge sbyong gi yon^{ba} tan gyi gzi med^{bb} pa dang / 'phags paⁱ rigs la

- 1 B, P: *te* for *zhing*. M: *zhing*, but perhaps corrected?
- 2 D, J: omit / *de*.
- 3 B, L, P: omit /.
- 4 B, F, P: insert /.
- 5 A, M: *ba* for *pa*. J: space of one letter.
- 6 A [end of line], B, P: omit / . F //.
- 7 B, P: *slong* for *sbyong*.
- 8 M, N: *ci* for *ji*.
- 9 B, P: omit *ji ltar na*.
- 10 A: *sbyong* for *slong*. B, P: insert *ji ltar*.
- 11 D, J, S: omit /.
- 12 B, L, P: omit / . F: // for /.
- 13 B, P: omit / . F //.
- 14 A, M: *bas* for *pas*. B: inserts /.
- 15 D, J, P: *mdangs* for *gzi*. (P: *mdangs* written small.) F: *gzigs* for *gzi*.
- 16 A, B, M, N, P: *'phrogs* for *phrogs*. F: *'phrog* for *phrogs*.
- 17 N, S: insert /.
- 18 M, N: insert /.
- 19 A, L: *bar* for *par*.
- 20 D, J, P: insert *na*. P: *na* and *ma* of *mdangs* written small.
- 21 B: *thar* for *tha*. P: space of one letter after *tha*.
- 22 F, L, N: *'gyuro*.
- 23 F, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 24 M, S: insert *la*.
- 25 L, M, N: *tinge*.
- 26 A, F: *ba* for *pa*.
- 27 A, J, S: insert /.

med^{az} pa dang / dge sbyong gi yon^{ba} tan gyi gzi med^{bb} pa dang / 'phags pa'i rigs la gnas
 pa'i gzi^{bc} med^{bd} pa dang / sbyangs^{be} pa'i yon tan dang /¹ yo byad bsnyungs^{bf} pa'i gzi
 med^{bg} pa dang / lus dang^{bh} ngag dang² sems yongs su³ dag pa'i gzi^{bi} med^{bj} pa 'di ni /⁴
 'od srung^{bk} dge slong gzi^{bl} phrogs^{bm} pa zhes bya⁵ ste /^{bn}

III. 17 A 382b3, B 164a6, D 162a7, F 216b6, J 175b2, L 179b5, M 220a4, N 278b7, P 158b2, S
 264b7:

'od srunga^a gzi^b phrogs^c pa de lta bu^d nmams la ni de bzhin^e gshegs pas sbyar^f ba'i⁶ sman
 gyis mi^g tshugs te^h /ⁱ 'di lta ste /

- 1) 'dod chags la mi^j sdug pa'i^k sman^l dang /^m
- 2) zhe sdang la byams pa dang /⁸
- 3) gti mug la rtenⁿ cing^o 'brel^p bar⁹ 'byung ba dang /^q
- 4) nyon mongs pa nmams la tshul bzhin yid la bya ba^r dang /
- 5) 'du 'dzi la¹⁰ dben par¹¹ dga' ba dang /^s
- 6) 'dzin^t pa thams cad spang ba'i¹² phyir dgon^u par gnas pa dang /
- 7) gsum bsdams¹³ pa'i^v phyir lus dang¹⁴ ngag dang¹⁵ sems yongs su¹⁶ dag pa
 dang /
- 8) sems las su¹⁷ rung bar bya ba'i phyir ting nge¹⁸ 'dzin^w yongs su¹⁹ dag pa'i
 sman²⁰

de bzhin gshegs pas^x sbyar^y ba 'di lta bu 'di dag gis de la mi^z tshugs te /^{aa} de shi nas^{ab}

- 1 D, F, J: omit /.
- 2 M, N, S: insert /.
- 3 L, N: *yongsu*.
- 4 A, D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 5 M, N, S: insert *ba*.
- 6 A, F: *pa'i* for *ba'i*.
- 7 A, B, P: omit /.
- 8 B, P: omit /.
- 9 A, F, L: *par* for *bar*.
- 10 D, J: *las* for *la*. P: also *las*, but written very small and obviously corrected.
- 11 A, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 12 B, F, L: *pa'i* for *ba'i*.
- 13 B, D, J, L: *bsdam* for *bsdams*. F: *bsdums* for *bsdams*. P: very small and hard to read, but
 probably *bsdams*.
- 14 L, N, S: insert /.
- 15 L, M, N, S: insert /.
- 16 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 17 L, M: *lasu*. F: omits *su*.
- 18 L, N: *tinge*.
- 19 L, N: *yongsu*.
- 20 B, P: insert /.

sems can^{ac} dmyal ba nyid du^{ad} 'gyur gyi /¹ de'i tha ma gzhan du mi^{ae} 'gyur ro² //

III.18 A 382b5, B 164b2, D 162b2, F 217a2, J 175b5, L 179b8, M 220a8, N 279a4, P 158b5, S 265a4:

gang dag yang^a 'jig rten las 'das pa'i sman^b 'di lta ste /^c phung po shes pa dang / kham
shes pa dang /^d skye^e mched^f shes pa dang /^g rten^h cing 'brel bar³ 'byung ba shes pa
dang / stong pa nyid dang /⁴ mtshan ma medⁱ pa dang / smon^j pa med^k pa⁵ shes pa¹ 'jig
rten^m las 'das pa'i sman 'di lta bu 'diⁿ dag gis kyang de^o la mi^p tshugs te /^q de shi nas
sems can^r dmyal ba^s nyid du 'gyur gyi^t /⁶ de'i tha ma gzhan du mi^u 'gyur ro⁷ //

III.19 A 382b7, B 164b4, D 162b4, F 217a4, J 175b7, L 180a2, M 220b2, N 279a7, P 158b7, S 265a6:

bstan^a pa 'di bshad ba⁸ na⁹ dge slong m^{al} 'byor^b spyod pa^c lnga brgyas¹⁰ bdag cag tshul
khrims yongs su¹¹ ma dag bzhin du dad pas byin¹² pa spyad¹³ par gyur^d na¹⁴ mi^e rung
zhes nyams^f par byas te¹⁵ slar khyim du dong ngo //^g de la^h dge slong gzhan dag cig 'di
skad du¹⁶ dge slong che ba'i bdag nyid can¹⁷ m^{al} 'byorⁱ spyod pa 'di dag bstan^k pa las^l
nyams pa ni¹⁸ shin^m tu¹⁹ ma legs so²⁰ zhes 'phya'oⁿ //

III.20 A 382b8, B 164b6, D 162b5, F 217a6, J 176a1, L 180a3, M 220b4, N 279b2, P 159a1, S 265b1:

bcom ldan 'das^a kyis^b dge slong de dag la 'di skad ces bka' stsal^c to // dge slong dag

- 1 A, D, J: omit /. F: // for /..
- 2 M, N: 'gyuro.
- 3 A: 'brel^d par for 'brel bar. B, F, L, M: par for bar.
- 4 B, P: omit /.
- 5 F, S: dang for pa. F, M, S: insert /.
- 6 A, D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 7 A, L, M, N: 'gyuro.
- 8 B, M: pa for ba.
- 9 B, L, M, N, P: insert /. F: do // for ba na.
- 10 D, J: brgya for brgya. F: rgyas for brgya.
- 11 L, M, N: yongsu.
- 12 D, J: phyin for byin.
- 13 D, J: spyod for spyad.
- 14 B, L, M, N, P: insert /.
- 15 B, M: insert /. P one letter space. F inserts //.
- 16 M: skadu. L, M, N, S: insert /.
- 17 B, P: insert /.
- 18 B: 'di for ni. P: ni small, and followed by one letter space.
- 19 F, J: du for tu.
- 20 L, M, N: legso. F: one space after so.

khyed¹ 'di skad du² dge slong che ba'i bdag nyid can 'di dag 'di ltar bstan^d pa las^e shin^f
 tu^g nyams pa 'di^h ni shinⁱ tu^j ma legs so³ zhes^k ma smra shig /^l de^m ci'i phyirⁿ zhe na /^o
 dge slong dag mngon par⁴ mi^p dga' nas⁵ khyim na gnas pa 'di ni^q dad pa^r can rnam^s kyi
 chos yin te / dge slong dad pa dang⁶ mos^s pa mang ba^t 'gyod pa dang ldan pa⁷ 'di dag gis
 bstan^u pa 'di thos nas /⁸ bdag cag tshul khrims yongs su⁹ ma dag^v bzhin du dad pas byin
 pa¹⁰ yongs su¹¹ spyad na¹² mi^w rung ngo^x zhes nyams par^y gyur^z to // 'od srung^{aa} nga
 lung ston^{ab} te^{ac} /^{ad} dge slong 'di dag ni 'di nas shi 'phos nas^{ae} dga' ldan^{af} gyi¹³ lha'i^{ag}
 ris^{ah} su¹⁴ skye bar 'gyur te / de dag de bzhin^{ai} gshegs pa byams pa'i nyan thos thog mar
 'dus pa'i grangs su¹⁵ chud par 'gyur ro¹⁶ //

¹⁷ dge sbyong gdol^{aj} pa lta bu'i le'u ste^{ak} gsum ba'o¹⁸ // // ^{al} bam po gnyis pa ste tha
 ma¹⁹ /²⁰

- 1 F, M, N: *khyod* for *khyed*.
- 2 M: *skadu*. B, M, P: insert /. F: inserts //.
- 3 L, M, N: *legso*.
- 4 A, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 5 A, B, M, N, P: insert /.
- 6 A, M, N: insert /.
- 7 A, M: *ba* for *pa*. M, N: insert /.
- 8 A, D, J, S: omit /.
- 9 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 10 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 11 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 12 M, N: insert /.
- 13 B, P: omit *gyi*.
- 14 L, M, N: *risu*.
- 15 L, M, N: *grangs*.
- 16 L, M: *'gyuro*.
- 17 A, F: insert //.
- 18 A, B, F, L, M: *pa'o* for *ba'o*.
- 19 A: *ma'a* for *ma*. M, N, S: *ma'o* for *ma*.
- 20 A, J, M, N: // for /. B, F: omit // *bam po gnyis pa ste tha ma* /. (See below for P.)

The Tibetan Text: Chapter Four

IV.1 A 382b11, B 165a3, D 163a2, F 217b3, J 176a5, L 180a8, M 220b8, N 279b7, P 159a5, S 256b5:

¹ de nas bcom ldan 'das^a la² tshe dang ldan pa³ 'od srung^b chen pos^c 'di skad ces gsol^d to
// bcom ldan 'das dge slong ji⁴ lta bus⁵ zhal ta^e bgyi ba lags /⁶ bcom ldan 'das kyis bka'
stsalf pa /^g 'od srung⁷ ngas zhal ta^h bya bar gnang ba'i dgeⁱ slong⁸ gnyis tej /^k gnyis gang
zhe na /^l dge slong yongs su⁹ dag pa¹⁰ 'jig rten pha rol^m tu¹¹ kha na maⁿ tho bas 'jigs
par^o lta ba¹² las kyip^p mam^q par^r smin^s pa la rton^t pa /^u 'dzem^v pa^w dang^x ldan zhing
'gyod pa dang ldan pa^y dang / gang yang zag pa zad pa¹³ dgra bcom par^z gyur^{aa} pa^{ab}
ste¹⁴ /^{ac} 'od srung^{ad} dge slong ma nyams pa 'di gnyis zhal ta byed par ngas gnang¹⁵ ngo
//

IV.2 A 383a2, B 165a6, D 163a4, F 217b7, J 176a7, L 180b2, M 221a3, N 280a4, P 159a8, S 266a1; Śikṣ D 36a7, P 44a8:

de ci'i phyir^a zhe na /^b 'od srung^c legs par^d gsungs^e pa'i chos 'dul ba 'di la rigs sna tshogs
las rab tu byung^f ba /^g sems kyip¹⁶ mos pa sna tshogs dang ldan pa /^h spongⁱ ba'i phyir
mal 'byor^k sna tshogs la gnas pa /^l kha cig ni dgon pa pa¹⁷ zhi¹⁸ ba'i mal stan^m laⁿ
mngon par¹⁹ dga' ba / kha cig ni bsod snyoms^o pa /^p kha cig ni^q grong 'dab²⁰ na gnas pa
/^r kha cig ni 'tsho ba yongs su^s dag pa /^t kha cig ni mang du thos pa la mngon par²¹

- 1 A, F, M, N: insert //. L, S: insert /.
- 2 B, P, S: insert /. P the phrases *bam po gnyis pa ste tha ma* / *de nas bcom ldan 'das la* are cramped, and would probably fit correctly without *bam po gnyis pa ste tha ma* /.
- 3 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 4 M, N: *ci* for *ji*.
- 5 D, J: *bu* for *bus*.
- 6 B, P: omit /, [P end of line]. F: // for /.
- 7 F, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 8 F, N: *sbyong* for *slong*.
- 9 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 10 B, F, M, N, P: insert /.
- 11 D, J, P: *tu* for *du*.
- 12 B, D, J, P, S: insert /.
- 13 M, N: insert /.
- 14 F, L: *te* for *ste*.
- 15 B, P: *gtang* for *gnang*.
- 16 M, N, S: *kyis* for *kyi*.
- 17 J, P: omit *pa*. P: has a space of one letter. See next.
- 18 B, N: *bzhi* for *zhi pa*.
- 19 A, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 20 J, L, M, N: *mdab* for *'dab*.
- 21 A, M: *bar* for *par*.

brtson pa¹ /^u kha cig ni chos smra ba^v /^w kha cig ni^x 'dul ba 'dzin^y pa / kha cig ni^z ma mo
 'dzin^{aa} pa /^{ab} kha cig ni^{ac} grong dang /² grong khyer dang / grong rdal^{ad} dang /³ yul
 'khor^{ae} dang / pho brang 'khor^{af} dag^{ag} tu⁴ zhugs nas chos ston^{ah} pa ste /^{ai} sems can^{aj}
 gzhan dag gi sems kyi spyod pa mams bsrung^{ak} dka' ba'i phyir ro⁵ // 'od srung^{al}
 de la dge slong zhal ta byed pas^{am} dge tatra vaiyāprtyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā sarva-
 slong gi^{an} dge 'dun thams cad kyi sems bhikṣusamghasya cittam abhirādhayi-
 ngu bar bya'o //^{ao} tavyaṁ / <Śikṣ 55.8>

IV.3 A 383a5, B 165b3, D 163a7, F 218a4, J 176b3, L 180b6, M 221a7, N 280 2, 5 159b3, S
 266a5; Śikṣ D 36b1, P 44a8:

'od srung⁶ de la dge slong dgon pa pa⁷ tatra ye bhikṣava āraṇyakāḥ prāntaśayyā-
 bas^a mtha'i⁸ mal stan⁹ pa¹⁰ gang yin pa¹¹ sanikās teṣāṁ / vaiyāprtyakareṇa
 de dag ni¹² dge slong zhal ta byed pas¹³ bhikṣuṇā sarveṇa sarvaṁ na karma-
 yongs su¹⁴ bsko^b bar mi^c bya'o // samutthānaṁ dātavyaṁ / <Śikṣ 55.8-10>
 zhal ta byed pas¹⁵ dge slong dgon pa pa¹⁶ de dag bsrung bar bya ste^d /^e dus ma yin bar¹⁷
 gsol^f bar¹⁸ mi bya^g /^h dusⁱ ma yin bar¹⁹ gtang²⁰ bar^j mi^k bya'o // 'od srung^l

- 1 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 2 A, B, M, N, P: omit /.
- 3 B, P: omit /.
- 4 J, P: *tu* for *du*.
- 5 L, N: *phyiro*.
- 6 S: *srungs* for *srung*. F: *bsrung* for *srung*. Śikṣ D, P: omit 'od *srung*.
- 7 D, J, P: *pa'i* for *pa*. (P corrected?) Śikṣ P: omits *pa*.
- 8 Śikṣ D, P: insert *gnas*.
- 9 A: *stand* for *stan*. L: *bstan* for *stan*. Śikṣ D, P: *bsten* for *stan*.
- 10 D, J: omit *pa*. L: *ba* for *pa*.
- 11 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 12 B, L, M, N, P: insert /. F: inserts //.
- 13 B: inserts /. L: inserts *yang* /. P: one letter space after *pas*.
- 14 F: *yong las su* for *yongs su*. S: *yong las* for *yongs su*. N: appears to read *yongs 'su* (perhaps *yongs lasu*?) for *yongs su*. L, M: *yongsu*. Śikṣ D, P: *thams cad du las su* for *yongs su*.
- 15 F, L: *bas* for *pas*.
- 16 A, M: omit *pa*.
- 17 B, F, L, P, S: *par* for *bar*.
- 18 A, L, M, N: *ba* for *bar*. F: *par* for *bar*.
- 19 B, F, L, P: *par* for *bar*.
- 20 L, M: *btang* for *gtang*.

gal^m te dge slongⁿ dgon^o pa pa^p la¹ dge
'dun gyi bya^q bar gtogs pa slob pa'i las
res bab na /² dge slong zhal ta byed^r pa
des³ las^s de bdag^t nyid⁴ kyis⁵ bya'o // ^u
yang na dge slong gzhan zhig bskos^v la^w
las de byed du gzhug ste^x /⁶ dge slong
dgon^y pa pa la^z gnod par mi^{aa} bya'o // ^{ab}

yadi punar āraṇyakasya bhikṣoḥ
saṃghaparyāpannam śaikṣaṃ karma
prāpnuyāt / etena vaiyāvṛtyakareṇa
bhikṣuṇātmanaiva tat kartavyam /
anyataro vā bhikṣur adhyeṣyo na punaḥ
sa āraṇyako bhikṣur utpīdayitavyas [/]
<Śikṣ 55.10-12>

IV.4 A 383a7, B 165b6, D 163b2, F 218a7, J 176b5, L 180b8, M 221b2, N 280b5, P 159b6, S 266b1; Śikṣ D 36b2, P 44b2:

'od srung⁷ de la dge slong bsod snyoms
spyod pa gang yin pa⁸ de la⁹ dge slong
zhal ta byed pa des kha zas bsod¹⁰ pa
bgo bsha^a bya'o // ¹¹
'od srung¹² de la dge slong¹³ nal 'byor^b
spyod pa gang yin pa^c de dag la¹⁴ dge
slong zhal ta^d byed pas¹⁵ 'thun¹⁶ pa'i¹⁷
'tshog¹⁸ chas dang /^e na ba'i gsos sman
dang /¹⁹ yo byad mams sbyin par²⁰
bya'o //

tatra yo bhikṣuḥ piṇḍacārīko bhavati
tasya tena vaiyāvṛtyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā
praṇītabhojaneṣu saṃvibhāgaḥ kartavyaḥ
/ <Śikṣ 55.12-13>
tatra kāśyapa yo bhikṣur yogācārī
bhavati / tasya tena vaiyāvṛtyakareṇa
bhikṣuṇā 'nulomikāny upakaraṇāny
upasaṃhartavyāni glānapratyaya-
bhaiṣajyapariṣkāraś ca / <Śikṣ 55.13-15>

- 1 F, M: omit *la*.
- 2 A, D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 3 D, J: *de* for *des*. J: one space after *de*.
- 4 Śikṣ D, P: omit *nyid*.
- 5 Śikṣ D, P: *gis* for *kyis*.
- 6 D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 7 S: *srungs* for *srung*. F: *bsrung* for *srung*. Śikṣ D, P: omit *'od srung*.
- 8 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 9 B, L, P, S: insert /.
- 10 A, B, F, L, P: *gsod* for *bsod*.
- 11 A, P: / for //.
- 12 S, Śikṣ D, P: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 13 Śikṣ D, P: insert *gang*.
- 14 B, M, N, Śikṣ P: insert /. L: one letter space.
- 15 L, M: insert /.
- 16 S, Śikṣ D, P: *mithun* for *'thun*.
- 17 A, M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 18 A: *mtshog* for *'tshog*. P: *'chog* for *'tshog*. S: *tshog* for *'tshog*. F, N: *'tshogs* for *'tshog*. J: one letter space after *'tshog* — *sa* deleted?
- 19 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 20 A, M: *bar* for *par*.

dge slong rnal 'byor^f spyod pa des
 phyogs ga¹ la gnas pa'i sa phyogs der²
 dge slong zhal ta byed pa des³ sgra chen
 po dang /⁴ skad drag po mi^g dbyung⁵
 zhing⁶ byed du yang⁷ mi^h gzhugi goi /⁸
 dge slong zhal ta byed pas⁹ dge slong
 rnal 'byor^k spyod^l pa¹⁰ de bsrung
 zhing¹¹ mal cha¹² yang^m sbyar bar bya'o
 //

kha zas bsod¹³ pa dangⁿ /¹⁴ yi gar^o 'ong
 ba dang /¹⁵ mal 'byor^p spyod pa'i sa
 dang¹⁶ 'thun¹⁷ pa'i¹⁸ bza^q ba dang¹⁹ bca'
 ba^r mams sbyin^s par²⁰ bya'o //²¹

yasmimś ca pradeśe sa yogācārī bhikṣuḥ
 prativasati tasmin pradeśe noccaśabdaḥ
 kartavyaḥ / <Śikṣ 55.15-16>

rakṣitavyo vaiyāvṛtyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā
 yogācārī bhikṣuḥ / śayyāsanopa-
 stambhanāśya kartavyā / <Śikṣ 55.16-17>

pranītāni ca saṃpriyāṇī¹ yogācāra-
 bhūmyanukūlāni khādaniyabhojanīyāny
 upanāmayitavyāni // pe // <Śikṣ 55.17-18>

1) Bendall, 55 note 6 reports the MS as reading
saripreyā.

dge slong de la dge slong 'di ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan^t pa rton²² pa'i phyir gnas pa
 yin te^u / de la bdag gis rjes su²³ 'thun²⁴ pa'i yo byad²⁵ thams cad^v mang du sbyar bar

- 1 B, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: *gang* for *ga*.
- 2 B, L, M, N, P: insert /. F: inserts //.
- 3 B, M, N, P: insert /.
- 4 A, F, M, N, S, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 5 A, L, Śikṣ P: *'byung* for *dbyung*. F: *dbyungs* for *dbyung*.
- 6 M, N: insert /.
- 7 S, Śikṣ D, P: *du'ang* for *du yang*.
- 8 A, M: // for /.
- 9 B, F, P: insert /.
- 10 S, Śikṣ D: *ba* for *pa*. M, N: insert /.
- 11 M, N: insert /.
- 12 F, M, N: *ca* for *cha*.
- 13 A, B, F, L, P: *gsod* for *bsod*.
- 14 B, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /, [P with one space].
- 15 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 16 F, L: insert /.
- 17 L, M, S, Śikṣ D, P: *mithun* for *'thun*.
- 18 A, L: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 19 F, M, N: // for /.
- 20 M, S, Śikṣ D: *bar* for *par*.
- 21 A: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: add *de bzhin du sbyar te* [= *peyālam*].
- 22 L, S: *ston* for *rton*.
- 23 L, M, N: *rjesu*.
- 24 L, S: *mithun* for *'thun*.
- 25 D, F, J, S: *byed* for *byad*.

bya'o^w snyam du shin tu¹ phangs² pa'i 'du shes bskyed bar³ bya'o //^x

IV.5 A 383a10, B 166a3, D 163b5, F 218b4, J 177a2, L 181a5, M 221b7, N 281a3, P 160a3, S 266b5; Śikṣ D 36b5, P 44b6.

'od srung^a de la⁴ dge slong⁵ mang du ye bhikṣavo bāhuśrutyo 'bhiyuktā
thos pa la⁶ mngon par⁷ brtson^b pa^c gang bhavanti teṣāṃ <Śikṣ 55.18>
yin pa⁸ de dag la⁹
dge slong zhal ta^d byed pas lung nos shig /¹⁰ lhogs shig /¹¹ kha ton^e gyis shig^f / kho bo
ni khyod kyi rim gro^g byed pa yin gyis /^h khyod ji ltaⁱ ji lta^j bur^k mang du thos par gyur^l
pa^m de lta de ltaⁿ bur dge slong gi dge 'dun mdzes par^o 'gyur bar^p gyis shig / 'dug la
brjod pas^q mdzes par gyis shig /¹² bdag nyid kyi shes rab kyang mchog tu 'gyur bar gyis
shig ces
spro^r ba bskyed¹³ par bya'o //¹⁴ utsāho dātavyaḥ / yāvat <Śikṣ 55.18-56.1>
'od srung^s de la dge slong zhal ta byed pas¹⁵ de dag^t dus ma yin par^u gtang^v bar^w mi^x
bya^y /z las su¹⁶ bsko bar^{aa} mi^{ab} bya'o //ac dge slong zhal ta^{ad} byed pa des dge slong
mang^{ae} du thos pa
de dag bsrung bar bya'o //¹⁷ te 'pi rakṣitavyāḥ / <Śikṣ 56.1>

IV.6 A 383b2, B 166a6, D 163b7, F 218b7, J 177a4, L 181a8, M 222a3, N 281a7, P 160a6, S 267a2; Śikṣ D 36b5, P 44b6:

- 1 J, P: *du* for *tu*.
- 2 B, P, S: '*phangs* for *phangs*. F: *phang* for *phangs*.
- 3 A, B, F, L, N, P: *par* for *bar*.
- 4 Śikṣ D, P: omit '*od srung de la*.
- 5 Śikṣ D, P: insert *gang dag*.
- 6 F: omits *la*. Śikṣ D, P: *par* for *pa la*.
- 7 A, M: *bar* for *par*. Śikṣ D, P: *byed pa la* for *mngon par*.
- 8 A, M: *ba* for *pa*. Śikṣ D, P: omit *gang yin pa*.
- 9 Śikṣ D, P: omit *la*.
- 10 B, P: omit /.
- 11 B, P: omit /.
- 12 B, P: omit /.
- 13 M, N: *skyed* for *bskyed*.
- 14 Śikṣ D, P: *bya zhing* / for *bya'o //*.
- 15 B: *pa* for *pas*. P: cramped.
- 16 A: omits *su*. L, N: *lasu*.
- 17 J: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: *de dag la bsrung ba'i bar du bya'o //* [P / for //], for *de dag bsrung bar bya'o //*.

'od srung ^a de la ¹ chos smra ba'i dge	ye dharmakathikā bhikṣavo bhaviṣyanti /
slong gang yin ^b pa ² de dag ³ dge slong	teṣāṃ pratihāradharmatā kartavyā /
zhal ta byed ^c pas ⁴ las su ⁵ mi ^d bsko bar	yāvad <Śikṣ 56.1-2>
bya'o // ^e	
grong dang ⁶ grong khyer dang // ^f grong rdal ^g dang // ⁷ yul 'khor ^h dang / rgyal po'i pho	
brang 'khor ⁱ dag tu 'jug ^j tu bcug la ^k chos 'chad ^l du gzhug ^m go ⁿ // ⁸	
chos nyan ^o pa dag bsko bar bya'o // ⁹	dhārmaśravaṇikāś codyojayitavyāḥ <Śikṣ
	56.2>
'khor ^p gyi ^q dkyil 'khor ^r rnam par ^s dag	sāṃkatthyamaṇḍalaṃ viśodhayitavyaṃ
par bya'o // ¹⁰	yāvat <Śikṣ 56.3>
'bel ¹¹ ba'i ¹² chos kyi ¹³ gtaṃ gyi ^l phyir ¹⁴	parśanmaṇḍalaṃ parisamsthāpayitavyaṃ
dkyil 'khor ^u du ^v gzhag ^w par bya'o // ¹⁵	<Śikṣ 56.2>
chos smra ba'i dge slong la dge slong ^x gang dag gnod pa ^y byed pa'i dge slong de dag ^z	
dge slong ^{aa} zhal ta byed pas bzlog par bya'o // dge slong zhal ta ^{ab} byed pas chos smra	
ba'i ¹⁶ dge slong la rtag tu bsu ^{ac} bar bya' // ¹⁷	
18 legs so ¹⁹ zhes bya ba mang ²⁰ du bya'o	sādhukārabahulena cāśya bhavitavyaṃ //
// ²¹	pe // <Śikṣ 56.3>

IV.7 A 383b4, B 166b2, D 164a3, F 219a3, J177a7, L181b3, M 222a6, N 281b4, P 160b1, S 267a5:

- 1 Śikṣ D, P: omits *'od srung de la*.
- 2 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 3 A, D, J, P: insert *la*. P: *dag la* written small; probably *la* is added later.
- 4 Śikṣ D, P: omit *la dge slong zhal ta byed pas*.
- 5 F, L, N: *lasu*.
- 6 A, D, J, S: insert *.*
- 7 B, J, P: omit *.*
- 8 F, J, M: *//* for *.*
- 9 A: */* for *//*. Śikṣ D, P: *chos nyan pa la brtson par 'gyur ba'i bar du bya'o //* [P / for //], for *chos nyan pa dag bsko bar bya'o //*.
- 10 Śikṣ D, P: *bsham par bya'o //* [P / for //] for *rnam par dag par bya'o //*.
- 11 A, F: *'brel* for *'bel*. B: *'phel* for *'bel*. P: *brel* for *'bel*.
- 12 A, B, F, L, Śikṣ P: *pa'i* for *ba'i*.
- 13 N: *kyi* written below *sa* of *chos*. Śikṣ D, P: omit *chos kyi*.
- 14 Śikṣ D, P: omit *phyir*. M inserts *.*. N: inserts *//*.
- 15 A: */* for *//*. Śikṣ D, P: *rnam par sbyang bar bya ba nas* for *du gzhag par bya'o //*.
- 16 B, P: *ba* for *ba'i*.
- 17 B, P: omit *.*. S: *bya'o //* for *bya /*.
- 18 Śikṣ D, P: insert *de la*.
- 19 F, L, M, N: *legso*.
- 20 Śikṣ D, P: insert *bar 'gyur ba'i bar*.
- 21 Śikṣ D, P: insert *de bzhin du sbyar te /* [= *peyālam*].

'od srung^a de la dge slong gang dag 'dul ba 'dzin^b pa dang /^c ma mo 'dzin^d par gyur^e pa de dag gi¹ gan du dge slong zhal ta byed pa de^f song la² ji ltar na bdag rma^g med^h cing ma nyams pa dang /³ ji ltar na bdag ltung ba medⁱ pa'i chos kyis⁴ zhal taj bya^k zhes yongs su⁵ dri bar bya'o // de nas 'dul ba 'dzin^l pa dang /^m ma mo 'dzinⁿ pa'i dge slong de dag gis dge slong zhal ta byed pa deⁱo bsam pa⁶ rig nas⁷ de'i bya ba dang /⁸ 'byung ba gang yin pa⁹ dang /^p byed pa gang yin pa¹⁰ de bstan^q par^r bya'o //

IV.8 A 383b5, B 166b4, D 164a4, F 219a5, J 177b1, L 181b5, M 222a8, N 281b7, P 160b3, S 267a7:

dge slong zhal ta^a byed pas^b 'dul ba 'dzin^c pa dang /^d ma mo 'dzin^e pa'i dge slong de dag la¹¹ phangs^f par¹² bya ba dang / dad pa dang /¹³ gus pa dang /¹⁴ zhe sa¹⁵ rab tu bskyed par¹⁶ bya'o // ^g dge 'dun gyi^h rnyed pa gang yin pa¹⁷ de dgeⁱ slong zhal taj byed pas¹⁸ dus^k dus su¹⁹ dge slong gi dge 'dun la dbul^l bar byaⁱm /ⁿ dge 'dun gyi^o myed^p pa^q bsags^r shing²⁰ sba^s bar mi^t bya^u ste /^v ji ltar rnyed pa bzhin du sbyin²¹ par²² bya /^w ma bskul²³ bar sbyin par²⁴ bya /²⁵ gnod pa med^x par sbyin par bya'o^y // des 'dun^z pa dang /²⁶ zhe^{aa} sdang dang /¹ gti mug dang /² 'jigs^{ab} pas 'gro bar mi^{ac} bya'o //ad

- 1 F, L: *gis* for *gi*.
- 2 A, M, N, S: insert /. F: inserts //.
- 3 B, P: omit /.
- 4 A, D, J: *kyi* for *kyis*.
- 5 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 6 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 7 F, M, N: *na* for *nas*. M, N, S: insert /.
- 8 F, L: omit /.
- 9 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 10 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 11 B, P: insert /.
- 12 F, N: *bar* for *par*.
- 13 B, F, L, P: omit /.
- 14 F, L: omit /.
- 15 D, J, P: *rje sa* for *zhe sa*. P: one letter gap between *rje* and *sa*.. B, F, L, N: *zhes* for *zhe sa* (no *tsheg*).
- 16 A, N: *bar* for *par*.
- 17 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 18 B, L, M, N, P: insert /.
- 19 F, L, N: *du* for *su*.
- 20 B, P: insert /.
- 21 B, P: *sbyar* for *sbyin*.
- 22 A, B, M, P: *bar* for *par*.
- 23 D, J: *skul* for *bskul*.
- 24 A, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 25 B, P: omit /, [P end of line].
- 26 B, F, N, P: omit /.

zhe^{aa} sdang dang /¹ gi mug dang /² 'jigs^{ab} pas 'gro bar mi^{ac} bya'o //ad

IV.9 A 383b7, B 166b7, D 164a6, F 219a8, J 177b4, L 181b7, M 222b3, N 282a3, P 160b5, S 267b2; Śikṣ D 36b6, P 44b8:

dge slong gi dge 'dun la rton^a par bya'i^b /^c khyim^d pa'i phyogs la rton^e par^f mi^g bya'o //h
 dge 'dun gyiⁱ bya ba la rton^j par bya'i^k /^l bdag gi³ bya ba la rton^m par miⁿ bya'o //
 dngos po gang la yang^o dbang bya ba'i na kvacid vastuni aiśvaryaśamjñōtpāda-
 'du shes bskyed par^p mi^q bya'i^r /^s yitavyā / <Śikṣ 56.3-4>
 bya ba ji⁴ tsam du chung pa⁵ yang^t dge kiyat parīttam api kāryaṁ saṁghamatenā
 'dun gyi^u gros bzhin bya zhing^v rang kartavyaṁ / na svamatena yāvan <Śikṣ
 dgar^w mi^x bya'o // 56.4-5>

IV.10 A 383b8, B 167a1, D 164a7, F 219b2, J 177b5, L 182a1, M 222b4, N 282a5, P 160b6, S 267b4; Śikṣ D 36b7, P 44b8:

dge 'dun gyi^a 'am /^b phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi 'am /^c mchod rten gyi^d yo byad gang ci^e
 yang^f rung ste / ji⁶ lta ba bzhin du gzhag^g par bya ste^h /ⁱ
 dge 'dun gyi^j dang⁷ phyogs bzhi'i dge na sāmghikaś cāturdiśasāmghikena
 'dun gyi dang⁸ bsre bar^k mi^l bya'o //⁹ saṁsrṣṭaḥ kartavyaḥ / <Śikṣ 56.5>
 phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi rnyed^m pa [evaṁ viparyayād <Śikṣ 56.5>]
 yang¹⁰ dge 'dun gyi dang bsre bar miⁿ
 bya'o //¹¹
 dge 'dun gyi dang^o phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi rnyed pa mchod rten^p gyi dang bsre bar
 mi^q bya'o //^r

- 1 B, P: omit /.
- 2 B, P: omit /.
- 3 A, F: *dga'* bar for *gi*. B: *gir* for *gi*. L, M, N, S: *dgar* for *gi*. P: one space before and after *gi*.
- 4 B, M, P: *ci* for *ji*.
- 5 A, B, F, L, N, Śikṣ D, P: *ba* for *pa*.
- 6 M, N: *ci* for *ji*.
- 7 A, F, L, N, Śikṣ D: omit *dang*.
- 8 D, J, P: omit *dang*. (P: space of two letters after *gyi*.) A: inserts / after *dang*.
- 9 A: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: *mi bsre ba'i bar du bya ste* / [P omits /], for *bsre bar mi bya'o* //.
- 10 S: *pa'ang* for *pa yang*. B, P: insert /.
- 11 A: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: *bzlog pa yang de bzhin no* //, for *phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi rnyed pa yang dge 'dun gyi dang bsre bar mi bya'o* //.

mchod^s rten gyi rnyed pa yang^t dge 'dun
gyi dang¹ phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi
dang bsre bar mi^u bya'o //²
gal te phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun la^v brel^w
phongs^x su³ gyur^y la /⁴ dge 'dun gyi
rnyed pa^z che bar⁵ gyur^{aa} na /⁶ dge slong
zhal ta byed pas⁷ dge slong^{ab} gi^{ac} dge
'dun bsdu^s la⁹ gros 'thun¹⁰ par¹¹
bgyis¹² te / dge 'dun gyi rnyed pa de¹³
las phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun la bshugs¹⁴
par^{ad} bya'o //

[evam staupikena saḥānyonyasamsarga-
pratiṣedhaḥ / <Śikṣ 56.5-6>]
yadi cāturdiśe saṁghe vaikalyaṁ bhavet
sāṁghikaś ca lābha utsado bhavet tena
vaiyāvṛtyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā bhikṣu-
saṁgham ekamānasam kṛtvā / sāṁghika-
lābhāc cāturdiśasāṁghikakāryaṁ
kartavyaṁ / <Śikṣ 56.6-8>

IV.11 A 383b11, B 167a5, D 164b3, F 219b6, J 178a1, L 182a4, M 222b8, N 282b2, P 161a2, S 268a1; Śikṣ D 37a1, P 45a2:

gal te de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten evam stūpe 'pi pralugne ['yam eva vidhir
zhig ral du gyur^a la /¹⁵] <Śikṣ 56.8>
dge 'dun gyi dang¹⁶ phyogs bzhi'i dge^b 'dun gyi rnyed pa che bar gyur^c na /¹⁷ dge slong
zhal ta byed pas¹⁸ dge slong gi^d dge 'dun thams cad^e bsdu^s la²⁰ gros²¹ 'thun²² par²³

- 1 F: omits *dang*. M, N: insert /.
- 2 Śikṣ D, P: *de bzhin du mchod rten gyi dang phan tshun bsre ba yang bkag go* / [D // for /], for *mchod rten gyi rnyed pa yang dge 'dun gyi dang phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi dang bsre bar mi bya'o* //
- 3 L: *'phongsu* for *phongs su*. M, N: *phongsu*.
- 4 A, F, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 5 B, P: *cher* for *che bar*.
- 6 A, D, J, Śikṣ D, P: omit / . F: // for /.
- 7 Śikṣ D, P: *pa des* for *pas*. M, N: insert /.
- 8 A, B, L: *sdus* for *bsdus*. P: *'dun bsdus* written small.
- 9 M, N: insert /.
- 10 F, L, S, Śikṣ D, P: *mtshun* for *'thun*.
- 11 A, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 12 A, B, F, P: *gyis* for *bgyis*. N: *bgyi pa* for *bgyis*.
- 13 Śikṣ D, P: omit *de*.
- 14 A: *gzshugs* for *bzhugs*. D, J, Śikṣ D, P: *bshug* for *bshugs*. N: *shugs* for *bshugs*.
- 15 A: omits / . F: // for / . Śikṣ D, P: *mchod rten zhig ral du gyur na yang de bzhin du bya'o* // for *gal te de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten zhig ral du gyur la* /.
- 16 A, B, M, N, P: insert /.
- 17 A, D, J: omit / . F: // for /.
- 18 B, M, N, P: insert /.
- 19 A, B, L: *sdus* for *bsdus*. P: *bsdus* written small.
- 20 M, N: insert / . F: inserts //.
- 21 B, P: insert *la*.
- 22 F, L, S: *mtshun* for *'thun*.
- 23 A, M, N: *bar* for *par*.

bgyis¹ te /^fdi skad ces de bzhin gshegs pa'i^g mchod rten 'di ni zhig ral du gyur^h la /ⁱ dge
 'dun gyi dang² phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi myed^j pa ni che^k bar^l gyur^m na /ⁿ gal^o te tshe
 dang ldan pa³ mams^p gnod pa med^q cing⁴ dad pa dang^r ldan la⁵ bzod cing gnang na /⁶
 bdag gis dge 'dun gyi dang /⁷ phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi myed^s pa 'di las dngos po
 cung⁸ zad cig khyer te^t /⁹ de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten 'di^u bcos par bya'o^v zhes brjod
 par^w bya'o // gal te dge 'dun gyis^x gnang na /¹⁰ dge slong zhal ta byed pa des de bzhin
 du¹¹ bya'o //y ci¹² ste dge 'dun gyis ma gnang na /¹³ dge slong zhal ta byed pa^z des^{aa}
 sbyin pa po dang /¹⁴ sbyin bdag mams¹⁵ dāyakān dānapatīn vā samādāpya prati-
 la^{ab} gsol ba^{ac} thob la¹⁶ de bzhin gshegs^{ad} saṃskartavya [ity ājñā] <Śikṣ 56.8-9>
 pa'i mchod rten¹⁷ gso¹⁸ bar bya'o //ae

IV.12 A 384a3, B 167b2, D 164b6, F 220a4, J 178a4, L 182a8, M 223a4, N 283a1, P 161a6, S
 268a5; Śikṣ D 37a2, P 45a3:

'od srung¹⁹ gal te mchod rten gyi myed yadi punaḥ kāśyapa kiyadbahur api
 pa ji^a ltar mang du gyur^b du²⁰ zin^c kyang staupiko lābho bhavet sa vaiyāpṛtya-
 /²¹ dge slong zhal ta byed pas²² dge 'dun kareṇa na saṃghe na cāturdisaṃghe
 dang²³ phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun la upanāmayitavyaḥ / <Śikṣ 56.9-10>
 bzhugs²⁴ par mi^d bya'o //25

- 1 A, B, L, P: *gyis* for *bgyis*.
- 2 M, N: insert /.
- 3 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 4 M, N: insert /.
- 5 M, N, S: insert /. F //.
- 6 A, D, J, N: omit /. F: // for /.
- 7 A, B, F, L, P: omit /.
- 8 B, P: *chung* for *cung*.
- 9 A, D, F, J: omit /.
- 10 A, D, F, J: omit /.
- 11 F, M, N: omit du.
- 12 A, B, P, S: *ji* for *ci*.
- 13 A, D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 14 F, L, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 15 Śikṣ D, P: omit *rnams*.
- 16 L, M, N, S: insert /. F //.
- 17 Śikṣ D, P: omit *de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten*.
- 18 B, Śikṣ P: *gsol* for *gso*. P: one space after *gso*.
- 19 S, Śikṣ D, P: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 20 A, D, J, S: *tu* for *du*.
- 21 A, D, J, L, Śikṣ D, P: omit /. F: // for /. Śikṣ D, P: insert *de*.
- 22 B, P: insert /.
- 23 M, N: insert /.
- 24 A: *gzhugs* for *bzhugs*. D, Śikṣ D, P: *bshug* for *bzhugs*.
- 25 A: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: *bya ste* / for *bya'o* //.

de ci'i phyir zhe na /^e dad cing dang ba^f
 mang po dag gis^g mchod rten la phul ba
 ni^h tha na ras kyⁱ kha tshar^l gcig tsam
 gang yin pa² de yang³ lha dang bcas paⁱ
 'jig rten gyi^k mchod rten yin na^l /⁴ rin po
 che 'am /⁵ rin po cher^m smos paⁿ dag lta
 smos^o kyang^p ci^q dgos /⁶ mchod rten la
 gos^r phul ba gang yin pa⁷ de ni^s de bzhin
 gshegs paⁱ mchod rten de nyid du rlung
 dang⁸ nyi ma dang /⁹ char^t pas deng^u
 kyang^v blaⁱ /¹⁰ /¹¹ mchod rten la phul baⁱ
 gos dbyig^w gam¹² dbyig gi rin du^x
 bsgyur^y bar mi^z bya'o //^{aa} de ci'i phyir
 zhe na /¹³
 mchod rten gyi ni¹⁴ rin thang cung¹⁵ zad
 kyang^{ab} med^{ac} la¹⁶ mchod rten ni cis
 kyang brel ba^{ad} med pa^{ae} phyir^{af} ro^{ag}
 //¹⁷

tat kasmād dhetoḥ / yā staupikā antaśa
 ekadaśāpi śraddhaiḥ prasādabahulair
 niryātītā bhavati / sā sadevakasya
 lokasya caityaṁ / kaḥ punarvādo ratnaṁ
 vā ratnasarīmatam vā yac ca stūpe
 cīvaraṁ niryātitaṁ bhavati tat tatraiva
 tathāgatacaitye vātātapavṛṣṭibhiḥ pari-
 kṣayaṁ gacchatu / na punaḥ staupikaṁ
 cīvaraṁ hiraṇyamūlyena parivarta-
 yitavyaṁ / <Śikṣ 56.10-14>
 na hi staupikasya kaścid argho nāpi
 stūpasya kenacid vaikalyaṁ <Śikṣ 56.14>

IV.13 A 384a6, B 167b7, D 165a2, F 220a8, J 178a8, L 182b4, M 223a8, N 283a5, P 161b2, S 268b2:

- 'od srung^a dge slong zhal ta byed pas de ltar^b yongs su¹⁸ dag par bya ste^c /^d des^e dkon
- 1 F, M, N: *tsar* for *tshar*.
 - 2 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
 - 3 S: *de'ang*. B, L, P: insert /.
 - 4 D, J: omit /. F //.
 - 5 B, F, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
 - 6 F, J, P, Śikṣ D: // for /.
 - 7 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
 - 8 A, D, J, S: insert /.
 - 9 L, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /. B: omits *nyi ma dang* /.
 - 10 D, J: *sla'i* for *bla'i*.
 - 11 A, Śikṣ D, P: omit /. F: // for /.
 - 12 A, L, M, S: insert /.
 - 13 F: // for /. Śikṣ D, P: *dang* [P omits] *zong gser du bsgyur du mi rung ste* /, for *dbyig gam dbyig gi rin du bsgyur bar mi bya'o // de ci'i phyir zhe na* /.
 - 14 F, L: omit *ni*.
 - 15 B, F, L, P: *chung* for *cung*.
 - 16 A, D, J, S, Śikṣ D, P: insert /. F: inserts //.
 - 17 J, N: // for /. Śikṣ D, P: *mchod rten la ni mchod rten gyi zong* [P zongs] *cis kyang brel phongs pa med do* // [P / for //], for *mchod rten gyi ni rin thang cung zad kyang med la / mchod rten ni cis kyang brel ba med pa'i phyir ro* //.
 - 18 L, M, N: *yongsu*.

mchog gsum gyi dang¹ ma 'bags² par³ bya'o //⁴ bdag gi rnyed bas⁵ chog^f shes par bya'o
//⁶ dkon mchog gsum gyis byin gyis brlabs pa'i dngos po rnams la bdag gir⁷ 'du shes
miḡ bya'o //h

IV. 14 A 384a7, B 167b8, D 165a3, F 220b1, J 178b1, L 182b5, M 223b1, N 283a7, P 161b3, S
268b3; Śikṣ D 37a4, P 45a6:

'od srung⁸ dge slong⁹ zhal ta byed pa^a
rab tu sdang^b ba'i sems dang ldan pa¹⁰
gang la la zhig gis¹¹ tshul khirms dang
ldan pa¹² /¹³ yon tan dang^c ldan pa¹⁴ /¹⁵
sbyin¹⁶ gnas mams^d la sems khros sam
/17 dbang byed cing bsgo¹⁸ blag¹⁹ byed
na /²⁰ de mi^e dge ba'i las des sems can^f
dmyal bar 'gro barḡ 'gyur ro²¹ //

yo hi kaścit kāśyapa vaiyāpṛtyakaro
bhikṣū ruṣṭacittaḥ śīlavatāṁ dakṣiṇī-
yānāṁ aiśvaryād ājñaptirṇ dadāti sa
tenākuśalena narakagāmī bhavati / <Śikṣ
56.14-16>

- 1 M, N: insert /.
- 2 M, N, S: *sbags* for 'bags.
- 3 M, N: *pa* for *par*.
- 4 A, J: / for //.
- 5 A, B, F, L, M, P: *pas* for *bas*. F: inserts *mo*.
- 6 A, J: / for //.
- 7 A: *gis* for *gir*. M, N: *gi* for *gir*.
- 8 F, S, Śikṣ D, P: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 9 Śikṣ D, P: insert *gi*.
- 10 A: *ba* for *pa*. Śikṣ D, P: omit *rab tu sdang ba'i sems dang ldan pa*.
- 11 Śikṣ D, P: omit *gis*.
- 12 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 13 B, F, P: omit /.
- 14 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 15 L: omits /. Śikṣ D, P: omit *yon tan dang ldan pa* /.
- 16 Śikṣ D, P: insert *pa'i*.
- 17 B, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /. F //.
- 18 A, F, L: *sgo* for *bsgo*. B, P: *bsko* for *bsgo*.
- 19 B, P: *brlag* for *blag*.
- 20 D, J, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 21 L, N: 'gyuro.

gal te mi ^h 'jig rten du 'ongs na yang ⁱ	yadi manuṣyalokam āgacchati dāso
bran dang ^j gzhan gyi las byed par 'gyur	bhavati parakarmakaro lābhī ca bhavati
ba dang / ¹ khu tshur dang / ² thal lcag ^k	khatacapetaṭapracandaprahārāṇām / pe /
dang / ³ lag cha ^l snyems ⁴ pas brdeg ⁵ pa	<Śikṣ 56.16-17>
dang ⁶ phrad ^m par 'gyur ro // ⁷	

IV.15 A 384a8, B 168a3, D 165a4, F 220b4, J 178b3, L 182b7, M 223b4, N 283b3, P 161b5, S 268b5; Śikṣ D 37a5, P 45a8:

'od srung^a gzhan yang dge slong^b zhal ta byed pa dge 'dun gyi bya ba^c las 'das te /⁸ rang dgar^d

- 1 F: // for /. Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 2 M, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 3 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 4 A, F, L: *gnyems* for *snyems*. B: *ma nyems* for *snyems*. P: one letter space between *snye* and *mas*.
Śikṣ D: *bsnyems* for *snyems*. Śikṣ P: *myem* for *snyems*.
- 5 B, P, S: *rdeg* for *brdeg*. F, L, Śikṣ P: *brdeg* for *brdeg*.
- 6 A, N: insert /.
- 7 A: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: insert *de bzhin du sbyar te* / [=peyālam].
- 8 D, J: omit /. F //.

dge slong mams la dbang byed cing¹ daṇḍakarmabhayatarjitam bhikṣum
 bsgo² ba dang /³ chad pas gcod pa dang / karoty akālapreṣaṇam akālaññaptirñ
 'jigs^e par byed pa dang /⁴ sdigs pa^f dang / dadāti / sa tenākuśalena karmaṇā
 dus ma yin par^g mngag^h pa dang /ⁱ dus bahuśaṅkur nāma pratyekanarakas
 ma yin par⁵ bsgo⁶ ba⁷ byed na⁸ de^j mi^k tatrāsyopapattir bhavati / yāvat
 dge ba'i las⁹ des nyi tshe ba'i¹⁰ sems can^l sahasraviddhaḥ kāyo bhavati / ādīptaḥ /
 dmyal ba phur^m pa¹¹ mang po zhes bya pradīptaḥ sarñprajvalitaḥ / pe / <Śikṣ
 baⁿ der skye bar 'gyur te / der skyes nas 56.17-57.3>
 lus la lcags^o phur brgya stong¹² zug
 cing^p /¹³ de dag¹⁴ 'bar /¹⁵ rab tu 'bar la /¹⁶
 kun tu^q rab tu mched cing¹⁷ 'bar bar^r
 'gyur ro¹⁸ //¹⁹

IV.16 A 384a10, B , D 165a6, F 220b7, J 178b5, L 183a2, M 223b6, N 283b5, P 161b7, S
 269a1; Śikṣ D 37a7, P 45b2:
 des tshul khirms dang ldan pa²⁰ /²¹ yon tan dang ldan pa²² /²³ sbyin gnas^a mams la

- 1 F, M, N: insert /.
- 2 A, F, M, N, S: sgo for bsgo. B: bgo for bsgo.
- 3 Śikṣ D, P: dge slong la, for dge slong rnam la dbang byed cing bsgo ba dang /.
- 4 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 5 A, M: bar for par. Śikṣ P: omits mngag pa dang / dus ma yin par.
- 6 F, S: sgo for bsgo.
- 7 A, F, L, P, S, Śikṣ D, P: bar for ba. P possibly corrected.
- 8 F: de for na. A, B, L, P, S, Śikṣ D, P: insert /. F //.
- 9 Śikṣ D, P: ba for ba'i las.
- 10 A: tse'i for tshe ba'i. S: tshe'i for tshe ba'i. B: pa'i for ba'i.
- 11 A, F, M: : ba for pa.
- 12 Śikṣ D, P: phur ba [P pa] stong gi par [P bar] dag gis [P gi] lus la, for der skyes nas lus la lcags
 phur brgya stong.
- 13 A, D, J: omit /.
- 14 Śikṣ D, P: omit de dag.
- 15 A, L, M, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 16 A, L: omits/.
- 17 Śikṣ D, P: omit mched cing.
- 18 F, M, N: 'gyuro.
- 19 A: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: insert de bzhin du sbyar te / [= peyālam].
- 20 A, M: ba for pa. M, N: insert dang.
- 21 A, B, P: omit /.
- 22 A, M: ba for pa.
- 23 B, P: omit /. F //.

sdigs^b shing¹ ngag gi^c las gdug pa smras² par³ gyur^d pa^e gang yin pa^f des⁴ de der skyes
nas⁵

lce'i ^g dbang po'i khyon ⁶ dpag tshad	yojanaśatavistārapramāṇā jihvā bhavati /
brgya par ^h 'gyur zhing / ⁷ de'i ⁱ lce'i dbang	tasya tatra jihvendriye bahūni
poi de ^k la lcags phur ^l brgya stong rab	śaṅkuśatasahasrāṇi ādiptāni ayasmayāni
tu ^m 'bab cing ⁸ de ⁿ dag kyang 'bar ⁹	nikhātāni bhavanti / <Śikṣ 57.3-4>
rab ^o tu 'bar / ¹⁰ kun tu ¹¹ rab tu 'bar la / ¹² kun ^p tu ¹³ rab tu mched cing 'bar te mer ^q 'gyur	
ro ^r // de ci'i phyir zhe na / ^s 'di ltar des ^t bsdigs ^u shing ^v ngag gi las ^w gdug ^x pa smras par	
gyur ^y pa'i phyir ro ^z //	

IV.17 A 384b1, B 168a8, D 165b1, F 221a2, J 178b7, L 183a4, M 224a1, N 284a2, P 162a2, S 269a3; Śikṣ D 37a7, P 45b2:

- 1 F, M, N, S: insert /.
- 2 D, F, J: *smra* for *smras*.
- 3 D, F, J, S: *bar* for *par*.
- 4 B, L, M, N, P: insert /. F //.
- 5 A, M, N, S: insert /.
- 6 F: inserts *pa*. Śikṣ D, P: *tshad* for *dbang po'i khyon*.
- 7 B, P, Śikṣ D: omit /, [P end of line].
- 8 B, P: insert /.
- 9 D, J, S: insert /. Śikṣ D, P: *kun tu 'bar ba dag gis* [P inserts *kun tu*] *'bugs par 'gyur ro //*, for *rab tu 'bab cing de dag kyang 'bar*.
- 10 A, F, L: omit /.
- 11 D, F, J: *du* for *tu*.
- 12 B, F, P: // for /. L, M, N: omit /.
- 13 D, J: *du* for *tu*.

'od srung¹ dge slong zhal ta byed pa
 gang la las^a dge 'dun gyi myed^b pa 'dus^c
 shing 'dus pa bzhag² ste^d /³ dus dus su^e
 mi^f sbyin^g zhing⁴ tho⁵ btsams^h la gtsesⁱ
 nas⁶ sbyin^j pa^k dang /⁷ kha cig byin^l /⁸
 kha cig^m maⁿ byin⁹ /¹⁰ kha cig la byin /¹¹
 kha cig la ma^o byin na^p /¹² de mi^q dge
 baⁱ las¹³ des yi^r dags^s kyi skye gnas
 rkyag 'jim^t byin pa^u nub ces^v bya ba der
 skye bar 'gyur ro¹⁴ //

yo hi kaścit kāśyapa vaiyapṛtyakaro
 bhikṣur āgatāgataṁ sāmghikaṁ lābhaṁ
 sannidhiṁ karoti na kālānukālaṁ dadāti /
 udvaśyāpayitvā viheṭhayitvā dadāti /
 keṣāñcin na dadāti / sa tenākuśalamūlena
 jaṅghā nāma gūṭhamṛttikāpretayonis
 tatrāsyopapattir bhavati / <Śikṣ 57.4-7>

- 1 S, Śikṣ D, P: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 2 A, L Śikṣ D: *gzhag* for *bzhag*.
- 3 D, J, Śikṣ D, P: omit /. F //.
- 4 B, P: insert /. D: one space.
- 5 A: 'tho for tho. J, L, S, Śikṣ D, P: *mtho* for tho.
- 6 M, N: insert /.
- 7 L, M, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 8 B, F, L, P: omit /.
- 9 A, F: insert *na*. F: writes *byin* with a *shad* on the left such that it resembles *khyin*.
- 10 B, P: omit /. F //.
- 11 A, B, L, P: omit /. L: inserts *la*. Śikṣ D, P: omit *kha cig byin* / *kha cig ma byin* / *kha cig la byin* /.
- 12 D, J, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 13 Śikṣ D, P: *rtsa ba* for *las*.
- 14 M, N: 'gyuro.

de¹ der skyes nas² yi dags^w gzhan gyis^x
kha zas blangs^y te³ de la bstan^z na /^{aa} de
bstan^{ab} pa'i tshe⁴ mig^{ac} gnyi⁵ ga⁶ mi^{ad}
'dzums^{ae} par zas de^{af} la^{ag} lta zhing⁷
bkres pa dang⁸ skom pas⁹ nyen^{ah} pa'i
sdug bsngal gyi^{ai} tshor ba myong gi /¹⁰
lo brgya stong du yang^{aj} zas de ni¹¹ thob
par mi^{ak} 'gyur ro¹² //
ji¹³ ste brgya la^{al} brgya lam na zas de
thob kyang¹⁴ ngan skyugs^{am} dang¹⁵
rnag khrag tu¹⁶ 'gyur ro¹⁷ //
de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'di ltar des^{an} tshul khrims dang ldan pa¹⁸ / yon tan dang ldan pa¹⁹
/²⁰ sbyin gnas rnams mgu bar ma byas shing /²¹ rang gi rnyed pas chog mi^{ao} shes par
gyur^{ap} pa'i phyir ro^{aq} //ar

tatrāsyānye pretā bhojanam grhītvā-
padarśayanti / sa udvaśyamānas tad-
bhojam animiṣābhyām netrobhyām¹
paśyamānaḥ / kṣutpipāsāparigato
duṣkhām / vedanām vetti na ca varṣa-
sahasreṇāpi tasya bhojanasya lābhī
bhavati / <Śikṣ 57.7-9> ¹⁾ Bendall prints
netrābhyām.
yad api kadācit karhicid bhojanam
labdham bhavati tad uccāram bhavati
pūyaśonitam vā // <Śikṣ 57.9-10>

IV.18 A 384b4, B 168b5, D 165b4, F 221a7, J 179a3, L 183a8, M 224a5, N 284b1, P 162a6, S 269b1:

'od srung²² dge slong zhal ta byed pa gang la las^a dge 'dun gyi 'am /^b phyogs bzhi'i^c dge
'dun gyi^d 'am /^e mchod rten^f gyi tshol²³ bar byas na^g /²⁴ de'i nram par^h sminⁱ pa ni ngas

- 1 N, Śikṣ D, P: omit *de*.
- 2 Śikṣ D, P: omit *skyes nas*.
- 3 A, M, N, S: insert /.
- 4 M, N, Śikṣ D, P: insert /.
- 5 F, J, N, P, S: *gnyis* for *gnyi*. (P cramped.)
- 6 A, F, S: *ka* for *ga*.
- 7 B, F, L, M, N, P: insert /.
- 8 A, M, N: insert /.
- 9 A, M: *bas* for *pas*.
- 10 A, Śikṣ D, P: omit / . B: *ngo* // for *gi* /.
- 11 J, S: omit *ni*. N: inserts /.
- 12 L, M: 'gyuro.
- 13 A, F, J, M, N: *ci* for *ji*.
- 14 B, P: insert /.
- 15 L, N: insert /.
- 16 B, N, P: *du* for *tu*.
- 17 L, M: 'gyuro.
- 18 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 19 A, M, N: *ba* for *pa*.
- 20 B, F, P: omit /.
- 21 D, F, J: omit /.
- 22 F, S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 23 A: 'chold for *tshol*. B, P: 'tshol for *tshol*. M: *chol* for *tshol*.
- 24 D, J: omit /.

bskal¹ pak^k bgrangs¹ pas¹ kyang brjod kyis^m miⁿ lang ngo^o //

IV.19 A 384b4, B 168b6, D 165b5, F 221a8, J 179a4, L 183b1, M 224a6, N 284b2, P 162a7, S 269b2:

'od srung^a dge slong zhal ta^b byed pa gang la^c las² nyes dmigs³ kyi gnas^d 'di lta bu 'di dag thos nas /⁴ khro 'am /^e gshe 'am / gnod par sems sam^f /⁵ khong khro^g ba skyed⁶ na /⁷ de ni gsor mi^h rung ngoⁱ zhes ngas bshad do // 'od srung^j de lta^k bas na⁸ dam pa'i chos 'di lta bu 'di thos nas⁹ dge slong zhal ta byed pas¹⁰ lus dang^l ngag dang¹¹ yid yongs sum^m dag par bya'o //ⁿ bdag dang gzhan bsrung¹² bar bya'o //^o

IV.20 A 384b6, B 169a1, D 165b6, F 221b2, J 179a6, L 183b3, M 224a8, N 284b5, P 162b1, S 269b4:

'od srung^a dge slong zhal ta byed pa^b rang gi sha la^c za yang^d bla'i¹³ /^e dkon mchog gsum gyis byin gyis^f brlabs pa'i lhung bzed^g dam /^h chos gos sam /ⁱ bsod snyoms sam /^j na ba'i gsos sman nam^k /^l yo byad yongs su¹⁴ spyad par^m ni miⁿ bya'o //

IV.21 A 384b7, B 169a2, D 165b7, F 221b3, J 179a7, L 183b4, M 224b1, N 284b7, P 162b2, S 269b5:

de nas bcom ldan 'das^a la¹⁵ tshe dang ldan pa¹⁶ 'od srung^b chen pos 'di skad ces gsol^c to^d //¹⁷ bcom ldan 'das kyis¹⁸ lhod pa nams kyi^e lhod pa'i^f chos dang /^g 'dzem¹⁹ mdog²⁰

- 1 A, L, S: *grangs* for *bgrangs*. A, S: insert *med* (A: *myed*). F: *'grangs* for *bgrangs*.
- 2 B, P: insert /.
- 3 A, J: *dmyigs* for *dmigs*. F: *mig* for *dmigs*.
- 4 D, F, J: omit /.
- 5 B, P: omit /.
- 6 B, L: *bskyed* for *ba skyed*.
- 7 D, J: omit /.
- 8 M, N: insert /.
- 9 B, M, N, P: insert /. F //.
- 10 B, P: insert /.
- 11 L, M, N, S: insert /.
- 12 A, F: *srung* for *bsrung*.
- 13 B: *bla'a* for *bla'i*. D, J: *sla'i* for *bla'i*. S: *bla* for *bla'i*.
- 14 L, M: *yongsu*.
- 15 L, S: insert /.
- 16 A, M: *ba* for *pa*. F: omits *pa*.
- 17 A, N: / for //.
- 18 F: *kyi* for *kyis*. B, P: insert /.
- 19 A, B, P: *mdzem* for *'dzem*.
- 20 A, M: *dog* for *mdog*. L: *'dog* for *mdog*. N: *dogs* for *mdog*. F: omits *mdog*. A: space of one letter.

mchis pa rnams^h kyi¹ 'dzem² mdog³ gi chos rnams bka' stsa^li to //
⁴ zhal taj byed pa'i le'u ste bzhi pa'o //

- 1 B, P: insert /.
- 2 A, B, P: *mdzem* for *'dzem*.
- 3 A, M, N, S: *dog* for *mdog*. F: *bdog* for *mdog*. L: *'dog* for *mdog*.
- 4 A, F: insert //.

The Tibetan Text: Chapter Five

V.1 A 384b8, B 169a4, D 166a1, F 221b5, J 179a8, L 183b5, M 224b3, N 285a2, P 162b4, S 269b7:

//^a bcom ldan 'das^b dge slong dgon pa pa gang^c dag bdag dgon^d pa pa^e zhes mchid^f
kyis¹ 'che na² / bcom ldan 'das ji³ tsam gyis na dge slong dgon pa pa lags /^g ji⁴ tsam^h
gyis naⁱ dge slong bsod snyoms pa lags / ci⁵ tsam gyis na dge slong^j phyag dar khrod^k
pa⁶ lags /^l de^l skad ces gsol^m pa dang /ⁿ bcom ldan 'das kyis⁸ tshe dang ldan pa⁹ 'od
srung^o chen po la 'di skad ces bka' stsal^p to //

V.2 A 384b9, B 169a6, D 166a3, F 221b7, J 179b2, L 183b7, M 224b5, N 285a4, P 162b5, S 270a2:

'od srung^a 'di la dge slong dgon pa pas dgon pa dang /¹⁰ nags^b tshal gyi^c gnas^d dang /
bas mthar gnas^e mal bca^f bar bya'o // chom rkun dang / gnag rdzi dang /¹¹ phyugs^g rdzi
med^h pa /¹² sdigi sbru^l med^k pa /¹³ ri dags^l dang¹⁴ bya mang po med^m pa /ⁿ sbrang bu
dang¹⁵ sha sbrang nyung ba^o /¹⁶ sgra nyung ba /¹⁷ ca co nyung ba¹⁸ de lta bu'i dgon pa^p
bas^q mtha' dag tu¹⁹ gnas par bya'o //

V.3 A 384b10, B 169a8, D 166a4, F 222a1, J 179b3, L 184a1, M 224b7, N 285a6, P 162b7, S 270a4:

de dgon pa'i²⁰ gnas de na gnas^a pa na /²¹ yid la byed pa brgyad^b bskyed par bya ste /^c

- 1 B, F, P: *kyi* for *kyis*.
- 2 B, F: *che na* for *'che na*. P: *'che na* cramped.
- 3 B, F, M, N, P: *ci* for *ji*.
- 4 B, F, M, N, P: *ci* for *ji*.
- 5 D, J, L, S: *ji* for *ci*.
- 6 D, J, L: insert *pa*.
- 7 B, F, P: // for /.
- 8 B, P, S: insert /.
- 9 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 10 A, B, P: omit /.
- 11 B, D, J, P: omit /.
- 12 A, L: omit /.
- 13 M, N: omit /.
- 14 A, L, M, N: insert /.
- 15 F, M, N: insert /.
- 16 B, P: omit / . P: has one space.
- 17 B, F, P: omit / . J: *ba* / totally obscured.
- 18 B: omits *ba*. P: *nyung ba* very cramped. B, L, M, N, P: insert /.
- 19 B, P: *du* for *tu*.
- 20 B: *pa* for *pa'i*. P: *na* of *dgon* and *pa'i* very cramped. M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 21 A, D, J, L: omit / . L: space of one letter.

brgyad gang zhe na /^d

- 1) lus la mi^e lta¹ bar bya ba dang /
 - 2) srog la mi^f lta² bar bya ba dang /³
 - 3) mnyed pa dang⁴ bkur sti⁵ la mi^g lta⁶ bar bya ba^h dang /⁷
 - 4) 'du 'dzi thams cadⁱ la mi^j lta⁸ bar bya ba dang /
 - 5) dgon pa dag tu⁹ ri dags^k 'chil ba^m lta^r khas blang barⁿ bya^o ba dang /^p
 - 6) dgon par dgon paⁱq yon tan yang dag par^r blangs te¹⁰ gnas par bya ba dang /
 - 7) chos kyi 'tsho^s bas 'tshoⁱ log¹¹ pas¹² 'tsho^u ba^v ma yin par¹³ bya ba dang /
 - 8) zang zing dang^w nyon mongs pa med paⁱ 'tsho^x bas 'tsho bar bya ba¹⁴ ste /
- yid la bya ba brgyad po^y de dag bskyed nas^z /¹⁵ dgon paⁱ gnas su¹⁶ gnas par bya'o //

V.4 B 169b3, D 166a6, F 222a4, J 179b6, L 184a3, M 225/6a2, N 285b3, P 163a2, S 270a7:
de¹⁷ dgon paⁱ gnas de na gnas pa na /¹⁸ sems can^a thams cad^b la byams paⁱ19 nam pa
brgyad bskyed^c par bya ste /^d brgyad gang zhe na /^e

- 1) phan paⁱf byams pa dang /
- 2) bde baⁱ byams pa dang /^g
- 3) gnod pa med paⁱ byams pa dang /
- 4) yang dag paⁱ byams pa dang /
- 5) tha dad pa med paⁱ byams pa dang /^h

- 1 D, J, S: *blta* for *lta*.
- 2 D, J, S: *blta* for *lta*.
- 3 M, N, P: omit /. [P end of line]
- 4 J: omits *dang*. F, M, N, S: insert /.
- 5 F, L: *bsti* for *sti*.
- 6 D, J, S: *blta* for *lta*.
- 7 J, S: // for /.
- 8 D, J, S: *blta* for *lta*.
- 9 B, P: *du* for *tu*. F: omits *tu*.
- 10 A, M, N: insert /. This marks the end of folio 84b in A, which resumes in V.11, below.
- 11 F: *logs* for *log*. L, M, N, S: insert *pa'i 'tsho* [L: one space erasure after *'tsho*; M *tsho*].
- 12 L, M, N, S: *bas* for *pas*.
- 13 F, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 14 F, N: omit *ba*.
- 15 D, F, J: omit /.
- 16 L, N: *gnasu*.
- 17 F, S: omit *de*.
- 18 D, F, J, L: omit /.
- 19 D, F, J, L: *pa* for *pa'i*.

- 6) zhi gnas kyi byams pa dang /ⁱ
 7) chos la nges^j par sems pa'i^k byams pa dang /^l
 8) bsam pa^m yongs su¹ dag ba'i² byams pa ste /ⁿ
 sems can thams cad la byams pa^o brgyad po de dag bskyed par bya'o //

V.5 B 169b6, D 166b1, F 222a7, J 179b8, L 184a6, M 225/6a4, N 285b6, P 163a4, S 270b3;
 Śikṣ D 113a5, P 132b5:

de ³ dgon pa'i gnas de na gnas ⁴ pa ^a na / ⁵	tena tatrāraṇyāyatane viharatā evaṁ
'di ltar sems bskyed par bya ste / ^b 'di ltar	cittam utpādayitavyaṁ / yady apy aham
bdag ni lam ring po nas ^c 'dir 'ongs la ⁶	araṇyam āgata eko 'dvitīyo na kaścit
gcig pu ⁷ gnyis su ⁸ med pa ^d ste / ^e legs ^f	sahāyo yo māṁ sukṛtaṁ duṣkṛtaṁ vā
par byas ^g pa 'am ^h / ⁹ nyes par byas pa ⁱ	codayet / <Śikṣ 201.12-13>
skul ¹⁰ ba'i grogs ^j ni gang yang med kyi /	
lha dang / ¹¹ klu dang / ¹² gnod sbyin	api tu khalu punaḥ santīme devanāga-
dang / ¹³ dri za dang / ¹⁴ sang rgyas bcom	yakṣā buddhāś ca bhagavanto ye mama
ldan 'das gang dag ^k bdag ^l gi sems kyi ¹⁵	cittāśayaṁ jānanti / te mama sāksīṇaḥ /
bsam pa ^m shes pa dag ni ¹⁶ yod de / bdag	so 'haṁ ihāraṇyāyatane prativasann
dgon pa'i gnas na ⁿ gnas la / ¹⁷ mi dge ba'i	akuśalacittasya vaśaṁ gacchāmi / <Śikṣ
sems ^o kyi dbang du song na ¹⁸ de dag	201.13-15>
dpang ¹⁹ du 'gyur ro ²⁰ //	

V.6 B 170a1, D 166b3, F 222b1, J 180a2, L 184a8, M 225/6a7, N 186a2, P 163a6, S 270b6;

- 1 L, M: *yongsu*.
 2 B, F, L, P, S: *pa'i* for *ba'i*.
 3 D, J, Śikṣ D: omit *de*.
 4 B: omits *de na gnas*. P: *de dgon pa'i gnas de na* written very cramped in space for seven letters.
 5 F, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
 6 B, L, M, N, P: insert /.
 7 B, P: *bu* for *pu*.
 8 L, M: *gnyisu*.
 9 F: // for /. Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
 10 L, Śikṣ D, P: *bskul* for *skul*.
 11 B, F, L, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
 12 B, F, M, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
 13 B, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /. F: // for /.
 14 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
 15 L, Śikṣ P: *kyis* for *kyi*.
 16 M, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit ni. F: omits *dag ni*.
 17 D, F, J, L, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
 18 L, M, N, S: insert /. F //.
 19 B, F, L, P, S, Śikṣ D: *dbang* for *dpang*.
 20 L, M: *'gyuro*.

Śikṣ D 113a7, P 132b7:

bdag lam ring po nas^a 'ongs^b shing^c gcig
 pu^d gnyis su¹ med de /² rten³ pa med /⁴
 bdag^e gi med^f /⁵ yongs su⁶ 'dzin pa med
 la^g /^h gal te 'dod pa la nam parⁱ rtog^j pas
 nam par^k rtog^l / gnod sems kyi nam
 par^m rtog pasⁿ nam par^o rtog^p /⁷ 'tshe
 baⁱq nam par rtog pas nam par^r rtog
 gam⁸ /⁹ mi dge ba gzhan la nam par rtog
 pas nam par rtog^s par gyur na /¹⁰ bdag^t
 'du 'dzi¹¹ dang /¹² 'du ba la^u mngon par
 dga^v baⁱ sems can mams dang^w bye
 brag med par 'gyur te /
 bdag gis^x lha dang /¹³ klu dang /¹⁴ gnod
 sbyin dang /¹⁵ dri za mams la bslus par
 'gyur zhing /¹⁶ sangs rgyas bcom ldan
 'das mams kyang mi mnyes^y par byas
 par 'gyur gyis /¹⁷ ci nas kyang bdag la
 lha^z mams 'phya bar mi 'gyur ba dang /^{aa}
 sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das^{ab} mams
 kyang dgyes par 'gyur^{ac} ba de ltar
 bya^{oad} snyam du sems bskyed par bya'o
 //

yadi punar aham iyad dūram āgata eko
 'dviṭīyo 'saṁstabdho 'mamo 'parigrahaḥ
 kāmavitarkaṁ vā vitarkayeyam vyā-
 pādam viḥinsāvitarkaṁ vā vitarkayeyam
 anyam vā 'kuśalavitarkaṁ vitarkayeyam
 nirviśeṣo bhaveyam saṁsargasaraṅga-
 ṇikābhir etaiḥ satvairḥ <Śikṣ 201.15-18>

te ca me devanāgayakṣā viśaṁvāditāḥ
 buddhāś ca bhagavanto 'nāttamanasaḥ
 syuḥ / tat tathāhaṁ kariṣyāmi yathā me
 devatā nāvadhyāyiṣyanti / buddhaś ca
 bhagavanto 'bhirāddhā bhaviṣyanti //
 <Śikṣ 201.18-19>

- 1 L, M: *gnyisu*.
- 2 N, S: omit /. [N end of line].
- 3 B, F, N, P, S: *sten* for *rten*. L: *bsten* for *rten*.
- 4 B, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /. F //.
- 5 L, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 6 L, M: *yongsu*.
- 7 D, J: omit /.
- 8 L, M, N, S: omit *gam*.
- 9 D, J: omit /. L: inserts *gang* after /.
- 10 D, J: omit /. (P: one space after *na*.) F: 'gyur ro // for gyur na.
- 11 D, F, J: *tu 'dzin pa* for 'du 'dzi. P: inserts cramped *ba*, with following *dang* also cramped.
- 12 F: // for /, end of line. L, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 13 B, F, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 14 B, F, L, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 15 B, F, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 16 D, J: omit /. F // for /, end of line.
- 17 B, N, P: omit /. F: // for /.

V.7 B 170a5, D 166b6, F 222b6, J 180a6, L 184b3, M 225/6b3, N 286a7, P 163b2, S 271a3:
de dgon pa'i gnas de na gnas pa na¹

- 1) so sor thar pa'i sdom^a pas^b bsdam² par^c bya /^d
- 2) tshul khrims kyi phung^e po shin tu³ kun⁴ bsrung bar bya /^f
- 3) lus dang⁵ ngag dang /⁶ sems yongs su⁷ dag pa dang /
- 4) tshul 'chos pa med pa dang /
- 5) kha gsag med pa dang^g /
- 6) 'tsho ba yongs su⁸ dag pa dang /^h
- 7) ting ngeⁱ 'dzin gyi^j sems mngon^k du bya ba dang /
- 8) ji⁹ ltar thos pa'i^l chos la rten pa dang /¹⁰
- 9) tshul bzhin yid la bya ba dang /¹¹ rab tu ldan pa^m dang /
- 10) yid byung baⁿ dang /¹² 'dod^o chags dang bral ba dang / 'gog pa dang /¹³ mya
ngan las 'das pa la^p gzhol ba dang /¹⁴
- 11) 'khor bas 'jigs skrag pa dang /
- 12) phung po ni gshed ma ste¹⁵ phyir rgol^q bar^r rig pa dang /^s
- 13) khams bzhi^t la myur du gdug pa'i dug tu¹⁶ 'du shes pa dang /
- 14) skye mched drug la grong stong pa¹⁷ ltar^u mos pa dang /^v
- 15) rten cing 'brel par¹⁸ 'byung ba la¹⁹ 'jug par²⁰ mkhas pa dang /^w

- 1 F, M, N, S: insert /.
- 2 F, N: *bsdams* for *bsdam*.
- 3 F, J: *du* for *tu*.
- 4 B, F: insert *tu*. P has one letter space at end of line, so could have been corrected.
- 5 D, J, S: insert /.
- 6 B, F, M, P: omit /.
- 7 L, M: *yongsu*.
- 8 L, M: *yongsu*.
- 9 M, N: *ci* for *ji*.
- 10 B, P: omit /.
- 11 M, P, S: omit / . P: one space.
- 12 B, P: omit / . F //.
- 13 B, F, P: omit / . F one letter erased here, da?
- 14 B, P: omit /.
- 15 F, L, M, N, S: insert /.
- 16 B, F, P: *du* for *tu*.
- 17 B, M, N, S: omit *pa*. P: *stong pa* cramped; is *pa* a later emendation? F: *stod du* for *stong pa*.
- 18 B, L, P: *bar* for *par*.
- 19 M, N: *bar* for *ba la*.
- 20 D, J: *pa la* for *par*. M: *pas* for *par*.

- 16) rtag pa dang¹ chad par^x lta ba yongs su^y spangs² pa dang /
- 17) sems can^z med pa dang / srog med pa dang / gso ba med pa dang / gang
zag^{2a} med par nam par^{2b} spyod pa dang /
- 18) stong pa nyid la mos pa dang /
- 19) mtshan ma med pa^{ac} spyod yul pa³ dang /
- 20) smon pa^{ad} med pa'i sems⁴ spel⁵ ba^{ae} dang⁶
- 21) khams gsum⁷ la rtag tu 'jigs⁸ pa'i yid dang ldan pa^{af} dang /
- 22) rtag tu mgo dang⁹ gos la me 'bar ba bzhin du brtson 'grus rtsom pa^{ag} dang /
- 23) brtson pa¹⁰ mi 'dor ba dang /
- 24) lus kyi skyon la yang dag pa¹¹ jiah lta ba bzhin du so sor rtag pa dang /^{ai}
- 25) sems kyia^j skye ba^{ak} dang /¹² 'jig pa la lta ba dang /^{al}
- 26) sdug bsngal yongs su^{am} shes pa la^{an} mngon par brtson pa^{ao} dang /^{ap}
- 27) kun 'byung ba thams cad kyi sred pa spangs¹³ pa dang /^{aq}
- 28) 'gog pa mngon^{ar} sum^{as} du bya ba la zhugs pa^{at} dang /
- 29) lam bsgom^{au} pa'i^{av} nal 'byor la brtson pa^{aw} dang /
- 30) phyi'i¹⁴ spyod yul dran pa^{ax} nye bar gzhas pa la¹⁵ rab tu gnas pa dang /
- 31) mi dge ba'i chos dang bral ba dang /^{ay} dge ba'i chos la mngon du^{az} phyogs^{ba}
pa dang /^{bb}
- 32) yang dag pa'i spong ba la shin tu^{bc} gnas pa dang /^{bd}
- 33) rdzu 'phrul gyi rkang pa mngon du^{be} gyur^{bf} pa dang /
- 34) dbang po lnga dang ldan pa^{bg} dang /^{bh}
- 35) stobs lnga'i shugs dang ldan pa¹⁶ dang /
- 36) byang chub kyi yan lag bdun la^{bi} bsam gtan pa dang /
- 37) 'phags^{bj} pa'i lam yan lag brgyad pa la mngon par^{bk} brtson pa^{bl} dang /

- 1 M, N: insert /.
- 2 F, N: *spang* for *spangs*.
- 3 B, P, S: *ba* for *pa*.
- 4 B, L: omit *pa med*. F: omits *med pa'i*. P: *pa med pa'i* sems very cramped into about six spaces.
- 5 B, F, J, L, P: *sel* for *spel*.
- 6 B, J, N, P: insert /.
- 7 B: *sum* for *gsum*. P: *khams* and *ga* of *gsum* cramped.
- 8 D, F, J: *'jig* for *'jigs*.
- 9 M, N: insert /.
- 10 F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 11 F, L: *par* for *pa*.
- 12 F, M, N: omit / . P twelve spaces after /.
- 13 M, N: *spang* for *spangs*.
- 14 L, M, N, S: *byams pa'i* for *phyi'i*. F: *pha'i* for *phyi'i*.
- 15 M, N: *par* for *pa la*.
- 16 B, F, M: *ba* for *pa*.

- 38) zhi gnas la gnas pa^{bm} dang /
 39) lhag mthong gis blta bar bya ste /

V.8 B 170b7, D 167a6, F 223b2, J 180b7, L 185a5, M 227a5, N 287a5, P164a4, S272a1:
 'od srung^a de lta bu'i go cha¹ 'di dag bgos nas /² nam gyi cha stod^b dang /^c nam gyi cha^d
 smad la mi nyal zhing rnal 'byor la^e brtson pa^f dang / rtag tu khyad par^g du 'gro bar^h
 dgon pa'i gnas de na gnasⁱ par bya'o //³

V.9 B 170b8, D 167a7, F 223b3, J 180b8, L 185a6, M 227a6, N 287a6, P 164a5, S 272a2:
 de dgon pa'i gnas de na gnas pa na⁴ lus brgyan par^a sbyor ba la brtson par^b mi^c bya'o //
 mal chas^d brgyan pa^e la brtson^f par⁵ mi^g bya'o //^h chos gos kyis brgyan pa la brtsonⁱ par^j
 mi bya'o // des rtswa⁶ rnying pa⁷ skams^k pa blangs la 'chags^l dang /⁸ 'dug sar^m legs par
 bting ste /⁹ bdag 'dug pa dang / dge 'dun gyiⁿ dang /¹⁰ phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi dang
 /¹¹ ma 'bags¹² pa dang /^o bdag gi gos kyis chog shes par dgon pa'i gnas der gnas par
 bya'o //^p

V.10 B 171a3, D 167b1, F 223b6, J 181a1, L 185a8, M 227b1, N 287b2, P 164a7, S 272a4:
 'od srung^a dge slong dgon pa pa^b gang gi tshe¹³ lus gso ba^c dang / 'phags pa'i lam nye
 bar brten¹⁴ pa^{1d} phyir^e grong ngam /¹⁵ grong khyer ram /¹⁶ grong rdal^f du bsod
 snyoms^g kyih^h phyir 'jug pa na /¹⁷ des sems 'di lta bus dgon pa'i gnas de nas 'gro bar bya
 ste / ma rnyed kyang yongs su yiⁱ chad¹⁸ par mi byaj /^k rnyed kyang^l dga' ba bskyed¹⁹
 par mi bya / las kyī mnam par^m smin pa yid la bya¹ / bsod namsⁿ nye bar brtan² par bya /

- 1 F, M, N: *ca* for *cha*.
- 2 D, J, S: omit /. F: // for /.
- 3 J, P: / for //.
- 4 F, L, M, N: insert /.
- 5 F, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 6 M, N: *rtsa* for *rtswa*. D: one space after *rtswa*. F: inserts *ba* after *rtswa*.
- 7 M, N: omit *pa*. F: *ting ba* for *rnying pa*.
- 8 D, J, S: omit /.
- 9 D, J: omit /.
- 10 B, F, P: omit /.
- 11 B, F, L, P, S: omit /.
- 12 M, N, S: *sbags* for *'bags*. F: *'phags* for *'bags*.
- 13 L, M, N: insert /.
- 14 B, L, P: *bstan* for *brten*. F, M, N, S: *brtan* for *brten*. (J: vowel not visible, possibly *brtan*?)
- 15 B, P: omit /.
- 16 B, P: omit /.
- 17 D, J: omit /.
- 18 N, S: *'chad* for *chad*. F: *mchad* for *chad*.
- 19 B, J, P: *skyed* for *bskyed*. D: *ba* and *ba* of *bskyed* cramped.

kyi nram par^m smin pa yid la bya¹ / bsod namsⁿ nye bar brtan² par bya / de bzhin gshegs
pa yid la bya ba bsam zhing^o des grong dang /³ grong^p khyer dang / grong rdal^q du bsod
snyoms^r kyi phyir 'jug par bya'o //

V.11 A 386a1, B 171a5, D 167b3, F224a1, J 181a4, L 185b2, M 227b3, N 287b5, P 164b1, S
272a7; Śikṣ D 73b2, P 86a3:

de ⁴ grong dang ⁵ grong khyer dang ⁶	tena grāmaṃ vā nagaraṃ vā nigamaṃ vā
grong rdal ^a du bsod snyoms spyod pa na	piṇḍāya caratā dharmasārinnāhaṃ
/ ⁷ chos ^b kyi ^c go cha ⁸ bgos la ⁹ bsod	sārinnahya piṇḍāya cartavyaṃ / <Śikṣ
snyoms spyad par bya'o //	128.3-4>
de la chos kyi ^d go cha ¹⁰ gang zhe na /	tatra katamo dharmasārinnāhaḥ / amana-
mig gis yid du 'ong ba'i gzugs mams	āpāni rūpāni dṛṣṭvā na pratihantavyaṃ /
mthong na ¹¹ rjes su ¹² chags par mi bya'o	manaāpāni dṛṣṭvā nānunetavyaṃ / evarṃ
// yid du mi 'ong ba'i gzugs mams	manaāpāmanaāpeṣu śabdagandharasa-
mthong na ^e yang ¹³ khong khro bar mi	spraṣṭavyeṣu vijñapteṣu nānunetavyaṃ
bya'o // de bzhin du sgra dang / ¹⁴ dri	na pratihantavyaṃ / <Śikṣ 128.4-6>
dang / ¹⁵ ro dang / ¹⁶ reg pa ¹⁷ yid duf 'ong	
ba dang / ¹⁸ yid du mi 'ong ba mams la	
rjes su ¹⁹ chags pa dang ²⁰ khong khro	
bar mi bya'o //	

- 1 B, P: *byed* for *bya*.
- 2 D: *brten* for *brtan*. J, L: *bstan* for *brtan*.
- 3 B, F, P: omit /.
- 4 Śikṣ D, P: *des* for *de*.
- 5 Śikṣ D, P: *ngam* for *dang*. A, D, J, L, S: insert /.
- 6 Śikṣ D, P: *ram* for *dang*. A, D, J, L, S: insert /.
- 7 D, J, L, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 8 M, N: *ca* for *cha*.
- 9 F, M, N: insert /.
- 10 M, N: *ca* for *cha*.
- 11 F, M, N: insert /.
- 12 L, M: *rjesu*.
- 13 S: *na'ang* for *na yang*. Śikṣ D, P: omit *yang*.
- 14 B, F, L, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 15 B, L, M, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit / . F: omits *dri dang* /.
- 16 B, F, L, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 17 A, D, J, P: *bya* for *pa*. N: omits *pa*. P: *ya-btags* appears to have been added later.
- 18 B, P, S, Śikṣ P [end of line]: omit /.
- 19 L, M: *rjesu*.
- 20 L, M, N: insert /.

dbang po shin tu⁸ bsdams^h pa dang /¹
 mig mi g-yeng ba dang /² gnyaⁱ shing
 gang tsam du lta³ ba dang /⁴ dul ba dang
 /⁵ cang shes kyi sems dang /⁶ sngonⁱ yid
 la byed pa'i chos mi 'dor ba dang /⁷ zang
 zing gisk^k ma 'bags⁸ pa'i rgyud kyis⁹ bsod
 snyoms spyad¹⁰ par bya'o //^l mthar chags
 su¹¹ bsod snyoms blang^m bar bya'o //
 gang nas bsod snyoms rnyed pa der rjes
 su¹² chags par mi bya'o // gang nas maⁿ
 rnyed pa der yang^o khong khro bar mi
 bya'o //

indriyasusaṁvṛtenānutkṣiptacakṣuṣā
 yugamātraprekṣiṇā / dāntājāneyacittena
 pūrvadharmamanasikāram anutsrjatā
 nāmiṣapraṁkṣiptayā santatyā piṇḍāya
 cātavyaṁ sāvadānacāriṇā ca bhavita-
 vyarṇ / <Śikṣ 128.6-8>
 yataś ca piṇḍapāto labhyate tatrānunayo
 na kartavyaḥ yataś ca na labhyate tatra
 pratighāto notpādayitavyaḥ / <Śikṣ 128.8-
 9>

- 1 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 2 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 3 L, Śikṣ D, P: *blta* for *lta*.
- 4 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 5 B, F, L, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 6 Śikṣ D, P [end of line]: omit /.
- 7 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 8 M, N, S: *sbags* for *'bags*.
- 9 F, L: *kyi* for *kyis*.
- 10 B, P: *spyod* for *spyad*. P cramped.
- 11 L, M: *chagsu*.
- 12 L, M: *rjesu*.

khyim bcu bslangs¹ pa las /² khyim bcu
gcig pa³ las bsod snyoms ma³ rnyed⁴ na
yang⁴ yongs su⁵ yi chad par mi⁷ bya'i /⁶
de 'di snyam du bram ze dang⁷ khyim
bdag 'di dag ni bya ba mang ba dag⁸ yin
pas /⁸ de dag gis bdag la sbyin par⁹ nges
pa¹ med^u de /¹⁰ de dag bdag^v la sems pa
yang^w ngo mtshar^x che na /¹¹ bsod
snyoms sbyin pa¹² lta smos kyang ci^y
dgos snyam^z paⁱaa 'du shes bskyed par^{ab}
bya ste / des de ltar yongs su yi^{ac} chad
pa med^{ad} par bsod snyoms spyad par
bya'o //

daśakulapraveśe na caikādaśāt kulād
bhikṣā na labhyate / tatrāpi na paritapta-
vyarṇ evaṇ ca cittam utpādayitavyarṇ /
evaṇ bahukṛtyā hy ete śramaṇa-
brahmaṇagrhapatayo na tair avaśyarṇ
mama dātavyarṇ / idarṇ tāvad āścaryarṇ
yan mām ete samanvāharanti / kaḥ
punarvādo yad bhikṣārṇ dāsyanti / tenai-
vam aparitapatā piṇḍāya cartavyarṇ /
<Śikṣ 128.9-12>

V. 12 A 386a2, B 171b4, D 168a1, F 224b1, J 181b1, L 185b8, M 228a2, N 288a4, P 164b7, S
273a1; Śikṣ D 73b7, P 86b1:

sems can gang dag de'i mig^a lam du
snang bar gyur^b pa¹³ skyes pa dang /¹⁴
bud med^c dang /¹⁵ khye'u dang /¹⁶ bu mo
dang /¹⁷ tha na dud 'groⁱd skye^e gnas
su¹⁸ song^f ba de dag la yang^g byams pa
dang /¹⁹ snying rje^h sems bskyed par
bya'o //

ye cāśya satvāś cakṣuṣa ābhāsam
āgacchanti strīpuruṣadārakadārikāḥ /
antaśas tiryagyonigatās tatra maitrī-
karuṇācittam utpādayitavyarṇ / <Śikṣ
128.12-14>

- 1 F, Śikṣ P: *blangs* for *bslangs*.
- 2 D, F, J, L, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 3 B, F: omit *ma*.
- 4 S: *na'ang*. A resumes at 86a1 with *yang*.
- 5 L, M: *yongsu*.
- 6 B, F, M, P: *bya'o //* for *bya'i* /.
- 7 A, L: insert /.
- 8 M, Śikṣ D: *bas* for *pas*. D, F, J, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 9 A, M, Śikṣ D: *bar* for *par*.
- 10 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 11 D, J, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 12 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 13 D, J: *pa'i* for *pa*. M, S: *pas* for *pa*. P: *ba* for *pa*.
- 14 B, L, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 15 B, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 16 B, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 17 B, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 18 L, M: *gnasu*.
- 19 D, J, S: omit /.

ci ¹ nas kyang sems can ⁱ gang dag bdag	tathāharṇ kariṣyāmi yathā ye me satvās
gi mig ^j lam du snang bar gyur ^k pa ^l 'am / ²	cakṣuṣā ābhāsam āgacchanti piṇḍapātāṇ
bsod snyoms sbyin pa ³ de dag mtho ^m ris	vā dāsyanti tān sugatigāmināḥ kariṣyāmi
su ⁿ 'gro bar 'gyur ba de ltar bya'o // ⁰ de	/ tādrśaṇ yogam āpatsye / <Śikṣ 128.14-
ltar brtson par ⁴ bya'o // ⁵	16>

V.13 A 386a3, B 171b6, D 168a3, F 224b4, J 181b3, L 186a2, M 228a4, N 288a7, P 165a1, S 273a3; Śikṣ D 74a1, P 86b3:

des bsod snyoms ngan nam ⁶ bzang yang	tena lūharṇ vā prañitarṇ vā piṇḍapāta
rung blangs te / ⁷ grong ngam ⁸ grong	saṃgrhya samantāc caturdiśaṇ vyava-
khyer ram ^a / ⁹ grong rdal 'di na ^b bdag gi	lokitavyaṇ / ka iha grāmanagaranigame
bsod snyoms 'di las ¹⁰ bgo bsha' ¹¹ bya	daridraḥ satvaḥ / yasyāsmāt piṇḍapātāt
dgos pa'i sems can ^c dbul po su yod	saṃvibhāgaṇ kariṣyāmi / <Śikṣ 128.16-
snyam du phyogs bzhir ¹² kun ^d tu ¹³ blta	129.1>
bar bya'o //	
gal te sems can dbul po zhig mthong na	yadi daridraṇ satvaṇ paśyati tena tat-
/ ¹⁴ des bsod snyoms de las ^e bgo bsha' ¹⁵	piṇḍapātāt saṃvibhāgaḥ kartavyaḥ / <Śikṣ
bya'o // ¹⁶	129.1-2>

- 1 Śikṣ D, P: *ji* for *ci*.
- 2 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 3 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 4 A, M, Śikṣ D: *bar* for *par*.
- 5 A, P: / for //.
- 6 A: *yang rung* for *nam*. L: *tam* for *nam*. A, M, S: insert /.
- 7 J: *ste* for *te*. A, S: omit /.
- 8 A, D, J, S: insert /.
- 9 N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 10 Śikṣ D, P: *la* for *las*.
- 11 M, N: *bsha* for *bsha'*. F: *bshad* for *bsha'*.
- 12 L, Śikṣ D, P: *bzhi* for *bzhir*.
- 13 N: omits *kun tu*. J, Śikṣ D: *du* for *tu*.
- 14 A, D, J, L, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 15 L, M: 'a written beneath *sha*. F, N: *bsha* for *bsha'*.
- 16 A, P [end of line]: / for //.

gal te sems can^f dbul po ma mthong na /¹
 des^g 'di ltar gang dag bdag^h gi migⁱ lam
 du snang bar ma gyur^j te / mik^k snang baⁱl
 sems can^m de dag laⁿ bsod snyoms kyi
 thog² maⁱ3 cha skal sbyin gyis⁴ byin
 nas^o len^p pa dag yongs su⁵ spyod cig
 snyam du sems bskyed la /^q
 des^r bsod snyoms^s de^t khyer te⁶ dgon
 paⁱu gnas der song la /⁷ lhung bzed
 dang⁸ lag pa bkru^s te /⁹ dge sbyong gi
 spyod^v pa dang /¹⁰ cho ga dang ldan
 paⁱ11 spyod pa^w bzang pos byin gyis^x
 brlabs^y la¹² des^z skyil¹³ mo krung^{aa} bcas
 te¹⁴ bsod snyoms de^{ab} bza' bar bya'o //¹⁵

ma chags pa dang /¹⁶ gnod sems med^{ac} pa^{ad} dang / mi^{ae} brkam^{af} pa^{ag} dang / ma zhen^{ah}
 pas

atha na kañcit satvaṃ daridraṃ paśyati /
 tenaivaṃ cittam utpādayitavyam / santy
 anābhāsagatāḥ satvā ye mama cakṣuṣa
 ābhāsaṃ nāgacchanti / teṣāṃ itaḥ piṇḍa-
 pātād agraṃ pratyarṇsaṃ niryātayāmi /
 dattādānāḥ paribhuñjatām / <Śikṣ 129.2-4>

tena tatpiṇḍapātāṃ grhītvā tadaranyāya-
 tanam abhiruhya dhautapāṇinā śobhana-
 samācāreṇa śramaṇacāritrakalpasam-
 anvāgatenādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhitena pary-
 āṇkaṃ baddhvā sapīṇḍapātāḥ paribho-
 ktavyaḥ // pe // <Śikṣ 129.4-6>

- 1 A, D, F, J, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 2 M, N: *thob* for *thog*.
- 3 M, S: *pa'i* for *ma'i*.
- 4 S, Śikṣ D: *gyi* for *gyis*. D, J, L, S: insert /.
- 5 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 6 N: *la* for *te*. F, M, N, S, Śikṣ P: insert /.
- 7 A, D, F, J, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 8 A, B, M, P: insert /.
- 9 A, F: omit /.
- 10 F, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 11 A, M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 12 L: *pa* for *la*. L, M, S: insert /.
- 13 A, F: *dkyil* for *skyil*. N: *bskyil* for *skyil*.
- 14 B, P: *ste* for *te*.
- 15 A: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: insert *de bzhin du sbyar te* / [= *peyālam*].
- 16 A, F: omit /.

zas zos nas¹ 'di snyam du lus 'di la srin
 bu'i rigs brgyad khri yod pa^{ai} dag 'di'i
 mthus bde bar gnas par gyur^{aj} cig / da²
 ni 'di dag zang zing^{ak} gis bsdu^{al} bar^{am}
 bya'o // byang chub thob nas ni chos
 kyis bsdu bar bya'o^{an} snyam du sems
 bskyed par^{ao} bya'o^{ap} //³

paribhañjutā caivaṃ manasikāra
 utpādayitavyaḥ / santy asmin kāye 'śītiḥ
 krimikulasahasrāṇi¹ / tāny anenaivaujasā
 sukhaṃ phāsurī viharantu / idānīm
 caiśām āmiṣeṇa saṃgrahaṃ kariṣyāmi /
 bodhiprāptaś ca punar dharmeṇa
 saṃgrahaṃ kariṣyāmi / <Śikṣ 129.7-9>

1) Bendall, evidently by misprint, has
krimikalu.

V.14 A 386a7, B 172a5, D 168a7, F 225a3, J 181b8, L 186a7, M 228b2, N 288b5, P 165a7, S
 273b2; Śikṣ D 74a5, P 86b8:

gal te yang⁴ de'i bsod snyoms^a ngan^b
 par⁵ gyur^c na /⁶ des^d 'di snyam du sems
 bskyed par bya ste /⁷ kha zas ngan⁸ pas^e
 ni bdag gi^f lus yang bar^g 'gyur^h /i spong
 baⁱ bzod par 'gyur /^k bdag gi bshang gci
 'byung ba^l nyung bar 'gyur /^m bdag la
 dad pas byinⁿ pa⁹ chung bar 'gyur /^o
 bdag gi¹⁰ lus yang ba dang¹¹ sems yang
 bar^p 'gyur /^q bdag rmugs pa dang^r gnyid
 chung bar 'gyur /¹²

yadi punar asya lūhaṃ piṇḍapātaraṃ
 bhavati tenaivaṃ cittam utpādayitavyaṃ /
 lūhāhāratayā me laghuḥ kāyo bhaviṣyati
 prahāṇakṣama uccāraprasrāvaṇiṣyandaś
 ca me paritto bhaviṣyati / śraddhādeyaṃ
 ca parittaṃ bhaviṣyati / kāyalaghutā
 cittalaghutā ca me bhaviṣyati / alpa-
 mlānamiddhaś ca me bhaviṣyati / <Śikṣ
 129.9-12>

1 M, S: insert /.

2 B, P: nga for da. N, Śikṣ D, P: insert Ita.

3 A, J (?), P [end of line]: / for //. B: omits //.

4 Śikṣ D, P: omit yang.

5 Śikṣ D, P: nyung bar for bsod snyoms ngan par.

6 A, D, J, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.

7 Śikṣ D, P: omit sems bskyed par bya ste /.

8 A: ngand for ngan. Śikṣ D, P: nyung for ngan.

9 A, M: ba for pa.

10 F, Śikṣ P: gis for gi.

11 D, J, M: insert /.

12 Śikṣ D, P: omit /, and add ro snyam du sems bskyed par bya'o // de bzhin du sbyar te / [= peyālam].

bdag la^s 'dod chags kyi sems¹ kyis^t kun nas^u dkris² par mi^v 'gyur ro³ snyam du yid la
bya ba 'di lta bu 'di^w dag bskyed par bya'o //

V. 15 A 386a9, B 172a8, D 168b2, F 225a7, J 182a2, L 186b1, M 228b4, N 289a1, P 165b1, S 273b5; Śikṣ D 74a7, P 87a2:

gal te des^a bsod snyoms mang zhig^b
myed na⁴ de la yang^c ran^d par^e bza' bar
bya'o // ^f dor^g ba'i chos nyid du yang^h
bya ste / ⁵ bsodⁱ snyoms de las^j rdo leb⁶
gang yang rung ba'i steng^k du gtor la / ⁷
'di snyam du gcan zan⁸ dang / ⁹ bya'i
tshogs gang la la zang zing gi¹⁰ zas 'dod
pa byin nas¹¹ len^l pa de dag 'di la zo
shig¹² snyam du sems bskyed par bya'o
//m

yadā punar asya prabhatūḥ piṇḍapāto
bhavati tatrāpi mātṛābhōjinā bhavitavyam
utsrjanadharminā ca / tataḥ piṇḍapātād
anyatarāyām śīlāyām avatīryaivam cittam
utpādayitavyam / ye kecin mṛgapakṣi-
saṃgā āmiṣabhojanenārthikās te
dattādānāḥ paribhuñjatām iti // <Śikṣ

129.12-15>

V. 16 A 386a10, B 172b2, D 168b3, F 225b1, J 182a3, L 186b3, M 228b6, N 289a3, P 165b2, S 273b7:

des zas zos nas lhung bzed dang^a lag pa bkru^b te¹³ dgon pa la brten^c nas gnas par bya'o
// ^d sngon yid la byed pa'i chos de^e nyid kyang mi dor^f bar bya'o //g

V. 17 A 386a11, B 172b3, D 168b4, F 225b2, J 182a4, L 186b4, M 228b6, N 289a3, P 165b3, S 273b7; Śikṣ D 112b5, P 132a3:

- 1 B: omits *kyi sems*. See next.
- 2 P: *kyi sems kyis kun nas dkris* very small, eight letter space. See above.
- 3 D, J: omit *ro*. A: inserts /. F, M, P: insert //.
- 4 F, M, S: insert /.
- 5 B, P: omit /.
- 6 L, P: one space. [L letter erased].
- 7 A, D, J, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 8 D, S: *gzan* for *zan*.
- 9 B, N, P, S, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 10 F, M: *gis* for *gi*.
- 11 F, M, S: insert /.
- 12 Śikṣ D, P: *byin ba'i* [P *pa'i*] *shyin pa byin pa 'di la zo* [P *bzo*] *zhig*, for *'di la zo shig*.
- 13 B, L, P: insert /.

'od srung¹ gal te dge slong dgon^a pa pa^b
 'bras bu ma thob pa² so so'i skye bo'i^c
 drung du^d sbrul^e dang³ gcan zan⁴ gtum
 po dag 'ongs na⁵ des de la 'jigs pa dang⁶
 skrag par mi^f bya'i /⁷ des 'di snyam du
 bdag thog ma nyid nas lus dang srog bor
 te⁸ dgon pa'i^g gnas su^h 'ongs kyis⁹ /¹⁰ 'di
 la bdag gis 'jigs par miⁱ bya /¹¹ skrag par
 mi^j bya'i /¹² byams pa'i^k sems bskyed par
 bya /¹³ zhe sdang mam par^l spang bar^m
 bya /¹⁴ 'jigs pa spang bar bya'oⁿ snyam
 du sems bskyed par bya'o //

gal te de ltar byas nas¹⁵ sbrul^o dang^p
 gcan zan¹⁶ de dag gis^q srog gcod cing za
 na yang¹⁷ des 'di snyam du

yadi punar asya tatrāranyāyatane viharate

'prāptaphalapṛthagjanasya vyāḍamrgā

āgaccheyuḥ tena tatra na bhayaṁ na trāsa

utpādayitavyaḥ evaṁ ca cittam utpādayi-

tavyaṁ / pūrvam evāham utsṛṣṭakāya-

jīvito 'ranyavāsam upagato na mayātra

bhetavyaṁ / nottrasitavyaṁ / api tu

maitrīm utpādayitvā doṣaṁ vivarjayi-

ṣyāmi bhayaṁ apanayiṣyāmi / <Śikṣ

200.12-15>

yady evam api kṛtvā te vyāḍamrgā māṁ

jīvitād vyaparopya bhuñjīran tena mayai-

vaṁ cittam utpādayitavyaṁ / <Śikṣ 200.15-

16>

- 1 S: *srungs* for *srung*. Śikṣ D, P: omit 'od *srung*.
- 2 F, M: insert /.
- 3 A, B, P: insert /.
- 4 D, S: *gzan* for *zan*.
- 5 D, J: *nas* for *na*. L, M, S, Śikṣ P: insert /.
- 6 A, M: insert /.
- 7 N, Śikṣ P: *bya'o* // for *bya'i* /.
- 8 F, M: insert / . N: inserts *nge*?
- 9 S, Śikṣ P: *kyi* for *kyis*. Śikṣ D: *kyang* for *kyis*.
- 10 A [end of line], M, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 11 B, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 12 F: *bya'o* // for *bya'i* / . B, N: omit /.
- 13 N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 14 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 15 B, L, M, P: insert /.
- 16 D, S: *gzan* for *zan*.
- 17 S: *na'ang*. L, M: insert /.

gcan zan¹ 'di dag la^r bdag gis^s zang zing
 tsam^t gyis tshim par^u byed mi^v nus kyi
 /w de dag gis bdag gi sha zos nas² bde ba
 la reg par gnas par 'gyur la /
 na punar ime vyāḍamrgāḥ śakyā mayā-
 miṣeṇa teṣayiturn mama māmsam
 bhakṣayitvā sukhasparśam vihariṣyanti //
 pe // <Śikṣ 200.17-18>
 bdag gis kyang snying po med^x pa'i lus
 las snying po blangs par^y 'gyur ba^z ni
 bdag gis myed pa legs par myed do //β
 da⁴ ni 'di dag zang zing gis^{aa} bsdu bar bya'o // byang chub thob nas ni chos kyis bsdu
 bar bya'o^{ab} snyam du sems bskyed par bya ste /ac 'od srung^{ad} dgon pa la gnas pa'i dge
 slong gis de ltar lus dang srog la mi^{ae} lta⁵ bar dgon pa la gnas^{af} par bya'o //ag

V.18 A 386b3, B 173a1, D 169a1, F 225b8, J 182b1, L 186b8, M 229a4, N 289b2, P 165b8, S 274a6; Śikṣ D 113a1, P 132a7:

gal te⁶ dgon pa'i gnas^a de na gnas pa na^b
 mi^c ma yin pa 'ongs na⁷ mdog sdug
 kyang rung /⁸ mdog⁹ mi^d sdug kyang
 rung /¹⁰ de la¹¹ chags par mi^e bya /¹²
 khong khro bar mi^f bya'o //g
 yadi punas tatrāraṇyāyatane viharato
 'manuṣyā upasamkramiṣyanti suvarṇā vā
 durvarṇā vā tena na tatrānūnetavyam na
 pratihantavyam / <Śikṣ 200.18-20>

V.19 A 386b4, B 173a2, D 169a1, F 226a2, J 182b1, L 187a1, M 229a4, N 289b3, P 166a1, S 274a7; Śikṣ D 113a1, P 132a8:

- 1 D, S: *gzan* for *zan*.
- 2 L, M: insert /.
- 3 Śikṣ D, P: insert *de bzhin du sbyar te* / [= *peyālam*].
- 4 B, P: *nga* for *da*. M: inserts *lta*.
- 5 B, L, P: *blta* for *lta*.
- 6 A, F: insert *de*.
- 7 B, L, P, S: insert /.
- 8 A, F, L, M, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 9 N, Śikṣ D, P: omit *mdog*.
- 10 A, D, F, J, L, N: omit /.
- 11 B, P: omit *de la*.
- 12 M: *bya'o //* for *bya /*. B, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.

gal te sngon sangs rgyas mthong ba'i
lha¹ dag dge slong dgon pa² pa'i gan^a du
'ongs te³ dri ba yongs su⁴ 'dri na /⁵ de la
dge slong^b dgon^c pa pa des⁶ ji^d ltar thos
pa bzhin du^e lha de^f dag la chos bshad
par bya'o //g

ci⁷ ste lha de dag zab mo'i^h dri ba yongs
suⁱ 'dri ste /⁸ dge slong dgon pa pa⁹ des
lan mi^j thebsk^k pa lta^l na¹⁰ des nga rgyal
med^m par byas la¹¹ 'di skad ces ma
bslabsⁿ pa la brnyas par^o mi^p bya ste /^q
sangs rgyas kyi bstan^r pa la lung^s mnos^t
nas^u 'bad^v de¹² khong du ma^w chud pa'i
chos^x mams khong du chud par gyur^y pa
de'i tshe¹³ de'i dus na¹⁴ dris pa^z thams
cad^{aa} kyi¹⁵ lan gdab par bya'o //ab

bdag ni chos nyan^{ac} pa^{ad} yin gyis¹⁶
khyed^{ae} spobs par gyis^{af} shig^{ag} ces
brjod^{ah} par bya ste /

'od srung¹⁷ dge slong dgon pa pas^{ai} de ltar lha de dag la go bar bya'o //18

yadi pūrvabuddhadarśinyo devatā
āraṇyakam bhikṣum upasamkramya
praśnam paripṛccheyuḥ tatra tenā-
raṇyakena bhikṣuṇā yathāśakti yathā-
balaṁ yathādharmādhigamāya tāsām
devatānām dharmo deśitavyaḥ / <Śikṣ
200.20-201.2>

yadi punas tāvaṁ gambhīrān praśnān
paripṛccheyur yān sa āraṇyako bhikṣur
na śaknuyād visarjayitum tena nirmānena
bhūtvā vāgbhāṣitavyā 'śikṣito na pari-
bhavitavyaḥ / yuñjiṣyāmi ghaṭiṣye
buddhaśāsane bhaviṣyati sa kālaḥ sa
samayo yadā 'dhigatān dharmān śrutvā
sarvakatham visarjayiṣyāmi / <Śikṣ 201.2-

5>

api tu pratibhātu te / vayan dhārma-
śravaṇikā iti // pe // <Śikṣ 201.5-6>

- 1 B: *ba lha* for *ba'i lha*. P: *ba'i lha* cramped.
- 2 A, M: omit *pa*.
- 3 A, B, L, M, P: insert /.
- 4 L, M: *yongsu*.
- 5 A, B, L, P: omit /.
- 6 F, M: insert /.
- 7 A, B, L, N, P, S: *ji* for *ci*.
- 8 Śikṣ D, P: '*dri* te for '*dri ste*, and omit /.
- 9 B: omits *pa*. P: *pa pa* cramped.
- 10 A, B, F, L, M, S, Śikṣ D, P: insert / . P: one space.
- 11 A, F, M, N, S: insert /.
- 12 A, F, M: : insert / . P: *da* for *de* (broken?).
- 13 A, F, L, M, S: insert /.
- 14 B, M, P: insert /.
- 15 B, P: *kyis* for *kyi*.
- 16 S, Śikṣ D: *gyi* for *gyis*. S: inserts / after *gyi*.
- 17 S, Śikṣ D, P: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 18 A: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: insert *de bzhin du sbyar te* / [= *peyālam*]. Note that the present sentence is

V.20 A 386b6, B 173a6, D 169a4, F 226a6, J 182b5, L 187a4, M 229a8, N 289b6, P 166a4, S 274b4:

'od srung^a gzhan yang dge slong dgon pa pa^b dgon pa la gnas pas /¹ dgon^c pa'i 'du shes shin^d tu² bsgom par^e bya ste^f / de la³ lus 'di ni⁴ rtswa⁵ dang /⁶ shing^g dang /⁷ rtsig pa dang /⁸ bong pa⁹ dang /^h migⁱ yor lta bu ste / bdag po med^j pa^{10/11} bdag gi med^k pa /¹² yongs su¹³ 'dzin^l pa med^m pa'o // lus 'di laⁿ ni bdag dang /¹⁴ sems can^o dang /¹⁵ srog dang /¹⁶ gang zag med^p kyid^q /¹⁷ chos 'di^r dag ni rten^s cing 'brel^t bar¹⁸ 'byung ba^u ste / rgyu dang rkyen^v las byung¹⁹ zhing²⁰ byed rgyu tshogs^w pa las byung ba ste /²¹ ci^x nas^y kyang bdag gi lta bar gyur^z pa thams cad^{aa} nye bar zhi bar^{ab} 'gyur ba^{ac} de lta bdag gis tshul bzhin so sor brtag par bya'o //^{ad} stong pa nyid dang /²² mtshan ma med^{ae} pa dang /²³ smon^{af} pa med^{ag} pa'i chos kyang rgyun mi 'chad²⁴ par²⁵ yid la bya'o²⁶ snyam du de lta bslab par bya'o //²⁷

V.21 A 386b9, B 173b2, D 169a7, F 226b2, J 182b8, L 187a7, M 229b4, N 290a3, P 166a7, S

not in the Sanskrit of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, but is in the Tibetan translation!

- 1 A, D, J, L: omit /.
- 2 J, N: *du* for *tu*.
- 3 M, S: omit *la*. A, B, F: *des* for *de la*. P: corrected?
- 4 D, J: omit *ni*.
- 5 F, N: *rtsa* for *rtswa*.
- 6 B, F, L, N, P: omit /.
- 7 B, L, M, N, P: omit /.
- 8 B, N, P: omit /.
- 9 B, F, S: *ba* for *pa*
- 10 F, M: insert *dang*.
- 11 A, N: omit /.
- 12 A, B, M, N, P: omit /.
- 13 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 14 B, F, M, N, P: omit /.
- 15 B, N, P: omit /.
- 16 B, F, N, P: omit /.
- 17 A, D, J, L, N: omit /.
- 18 A, L, M, N, S: *par* for *bar*.
- 19 B, L, M, P, S: *'byung* for *byung*.
- 20 F, L, M, S: insert /.
- 21 B, P: omit / . J: *ste* / obscured and illegible.
- 22 B, N, P: omit /.
- 23 B, N, P: omit /.
- 24 B, F, M, P: *chad* for *'chad*.
- 25 D, J, P: insert *yang*. (P: a number of words, but particularly *rgyun* and *par yang yid* very cramped.)
- 26 D, J, M: insert //.
- 27 A, P: / for //.

275a2; Śikṣ D 113a4, P 132b3:

dgon pa'i gnas de na^a gnas^b pa des¹
 rtswa² dang³ shing^c gel pa⁴ dang /⁵ sman
 dang⁶ nags tshal de dag ji⁷ ltar 'byung ba
 dang /⁸ ji^d ltar 'jig⁹ par^e 'gyur^f ba dang /^g
 ji^h ltar phyi rol gyiⁱ dngos po 'di dag
 bdag po med^j pa /^k bdag gi^l med^m pa /¹⁰
 yongs su¹¹ 'dzinⁿ pa med^o pa¹² de ltar g-
 yo ba med^p cing byed pa¹³ med^q de^r /
 stong bzhin du skye zhing 'jig^s la^t su
 yang^u de dag skye bar^v mi^w byed^x /¹⁴
 'gog par mi^y byed pa'i¹⁵ mtshan ma
 bzung la^z /¹⁶

tena tatrāraṇyāyatane prativasatā tṛṇa-
 gulmauṣadhivanaspatinām nimittam
 grahitavyam katham ete bhavanti /
 yathaiśāṁ bhāvanām asvāmikānām
 amamānām aparigrahāṇām evam
 niśceṣṭānām nirvyāpārāṇām bhavaty
 utpādo bhaṅgaś ca / na caiśāṁ kaścid
 utpādayitā na nirodhayitā / <Śikṣ 201.6-8>

- 1 F, M: insert /. P: *gnas pa des* extremely cramped.
- 2 B, L, P: *rtswa* for *rtswa*.
- 3 D, J, L, S: insert /.
- 4 A, B, F, L, S, Śikṣ D: *ba* for *pa*
- 5 B, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 6 D, J, S: insert /.
- 7 F, M: *ci* for *ji*.
- 8 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 9 B, P: *'jigs* for *'jig*.
- 10 B, L, P: omit /.
- 11 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 12 B: omits *med pa*. A, F, M: insert /. P: *med pa* and following *de ltar* extremely cramped.
- 13 M, S: insert *po*.
- 14 B, P: omit /.
- 15 B: omits *mi byed pa'i*. P: from *mi byed pa'i* to following *de bzhin* cramped.
- 16 B, L, P: omit /.

de bzhin du lus 'di yang^{aa} rtswa^{ab} dang /¹
 rtsig pa dang /² shing dang³ bong ba⁴
 dang /⁵ mig^{ac} yor^{ad} lta bu ste /^{ae} bdag po
 med pa /^{af} bdag gi⁶ med pa /⁷ yongs su⁸
 'dzin^{ag} pa med^{ah} pa /⁹ g-yo ba med^{ai} pa
 /¹⁰ byed pa med^{aj} pa^{ak} /¹¹ rgyu dang
 rkyen^{al} tshogs pa las 'byung gi /¹² rgyu
 dang rkyen ma tshang^{am} na mian 'byung
 ba ste / 'di la don dam par^{ao} skye ba dang
 /¹³ 'gag^{ap} pa'i chos¹⁴ gang yang med^{aq}
 do¹⁵ snyam du mtshan ma^{ar} gzung^{as} bar
 bya'o^{at} //au

evam evāyaṁ kāyaś tṛṇakāṣṭhakudya-
 pratibhāśopamo 'svāmiko 'mamo 'pari-
 graho niśceṣṭo nirvyāpāro hetupratyaya-
 yuktyā utpadyate / hetupratyayavaika-
 lyān nirudhyate / na punar atra kaścid
 dharmah paramārthata utpadyate vā
 nirudhyate vā // <Śikṣ 201.8-11>

V.22 A 387a1, B 173b6, D 169b3, F 226b7, J 183a3, L 187b2, M 229b8, N 290a6, P 166b2, S 275a6:

'od srung^a de ltar dge slong dgon pa pas chos kyi yi dam gyi spyod pa 'di lta bus dgon
 pa la gnas par bya'o // de lta bu'i^b chos la^c gnas pa de nyan thos kyi theg pa pa 'am / rang
 sangs rgyas kyi theg pa pa^d 'am / byang chub sems dpa'i^e theg pa pa zhig tu¹⁶ myur du
 khyad par du¹⁷ 'gyur ro¹⁸ //f gal te nyan thos kyi theg pa par¹⁹ gyur^g na ni²⁰ de^h myur du

- 1 A, B, L, N, P: omit /.
- 2 J, N: omit / . (J: this and next clause cramped).
- 3 A, D, S: insert /.
- 4 A, L: pa for ba.
- 5 B, F, P: omit /.
- 6 D, J: insert ba. L: one letter erased here.
- 7 B, F, N, P: omit /.
- 8 F, L, M, N: yongsu. A: med pa / yongs su obscured and illegible.
- 9 Śikṣ D, P: omit bdag gi med pa / yongs su 'dzin pa med pa de ltar g-yo ba med cing byed pa med
 de / stong bzhin du skye zhing 'jig la su yang de dag skye bar mi byed / 'gog par mi byed pa'i mtshan ma
 bzung la / de bzhin du lus 'di yang rtswa dang / rtsig pa dang / shing dang / bong ba dang / mig yor lta
 bu ste / bdag po med pa / bdag gi med pa / yongs su 'dzin pa med pa /. The equivalent is however found
 in Sanskrit!
- 10 B, N, P: omit /.
- 11 B, N, P: omit /.
- 12 B, N, P: omit /.
- 13 B, L, N, P, S, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 14 A, N: tshogs for chos.
- 15 F, M: medo. B: inserts //. P: inserts /.
- 16 B, P: du for tu. F: omits tu.
- 17 B: omits du. P: bar tu (cramped) for par du.
- 18 F, L, M: 'gyuro.
- 19 B, P: pa for par. M: ra written below pa.
- 20 M, S: insert /.

'bras bu thob par 'gyur ro¹ //i ci² ste dei las kyi sgrib pas^k bsgribs tel 'bras bu thob par ma
 gyur^m naⁿ yang^o de zag pa mams las^p sems mam par^q grol gyi bar du /^β de bzhin gshegs
 pa gnyis sam gsum las mi^r 'da'o^s //t gal te rang sangs rgyas kyi theg pa par gyur^u na ni⁴
 de myur ba nyid du rang byang chub thob par 'gyur ro⁵ //6 gal te byang chub sems dpa'i
 theg pa par^v gyur^w na ni /⁷ de^x tshe 'di⁸ nyid la mi skye ba'i chos la bzod pa thob par
 'gyur^y te / de sgrib pa med^z par sangs rgyas mthong bar 'gyur ro⁹ //aa sgrib^{ab} pa med^{ac}
 par sangs rgyas mthong nas^{ad} myur du bla na med^{ae} pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang
 chub mngon par¹⁰ rdzogs par 'tshang^{af} rgya bar 'gyur ro¹¹ //

V.23 A 387a4, B 174a3, D 169b6, F 227a4, J 183a7, L 187b7, M 230a5, N 290b4, P 166b7, S
 275b5:

dgon pa pa'i le'u 'di bshad pa na /¹² dge slong lnga brgya len^a pa med^b par zag pa mams
 las sems mam par^c grol lo¹³ //

¹⁴ dgon pa pa'i le'u sted lnga pa'o^e //

- 1 F, L, M, N: 'gyuro.
- 2 A, B, L, N, P, S: ji for ci. F: begins folio 29a with ci in a different hand.
- 3 A, D, F, J, L, N: omit /.
- 4 F, L, M, S: insert /.
- 5 F, M, N: 'gyuro.
- 6 A, F: / for //.
- 7 A, D, F, J, N: omit /.
- 8 B, P: de for 'di.
- 9 A [end of line], F, L, M, N: 'gyuro.
- 10 A, M: bar for par.
- 11 F, L, M, N: 'gyuro.
- 12 A, D, F, J, N: omit /.
- 13 L, M: grolo.
- 14 A, F: insert //.

The Tibetan Text: Chapter 6

VI.1 A 387a5, B 174a4, D 169b7, F 227a5, J 183a8, L 187b7, M 230a5, N 290b5, P 166b8, S 275b5:

//a 'od srung^b de la ji^c ltar na dge slong^d bsod snyoms^e spyod pa^f yin zhe na /g 'od
 srung^h 'diⁱ la dge slong^l bsod snyoms² spyod^j pas³ 'di ltar bdag bsod snyoms^k kyi kha
 zas la gnas te /^l legs par gsungs paⁱ chos 'dul ba la^m rab tu byung laⁿ /⁴ bdag sngon gyi
 smon lam dang⁵ dam bcas pa la⁶ gnas par bya'o^o snyam du bsab⁷ par⁸ bya'o /⁹ dge
 slong bsod snyoms^p spyod pa lhag paⁱ¹⁰ bsam pa¹¹ dang ldan pa¹² des¹³ mi^q brkam
 pa¹⁴ dang /^r tshul^s 'chos pa med^t pa dang / kha gsag^u med^v pa dang / mgron¹⁵ du^w bod^x
 pa^y thams cad^z kyi sems med^{aa} pa dang / dge 'dun gyi rnyed pa dang¹⁶ ma^{ab} 'bags^{ac} pa^{ad}
 dang /¹⁷ yi dam¹⁸ la brtan^{ae} par¹⁹ bya'o //²⁰

VI.2 A 387a7, B 174a7, D 170a2, F 227a8, J 183b2, L 188a2, M 230a8, N 291a1, P 167a3, S 276a2; Śikṣ D 74b1, P 87a3:

des kha zas bzang po rnams la ro bro ba'i tena sarveṇa rasasamjñā notpādayitavyā
 'du shes thams cad^a kyi^b thams cad^c du // pe // <Śikṣ 129.16>
 bskyed par^d mi^e bya'o //

- 1 B: omits *dge slong* (See next).
- 2 F: *rnyoms* for *snyoms*. P: *dge slong bsod snyoms* in six spaces (See previous).
- 3 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 4 D, F, J, L: omit /.
- 5 F, M: insert /.
- 6 B, P: insert /.
- 7 F, M, S: *bsam* for *bslab*.
- 8 F, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 9 A: / for //. B, P [end of line]: omit //.
- 10 A, D: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 11 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 12 A, F: *ba* for *pa*.
- 13 B, P: insert /.
- 14 F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 15 D, F, J: *'gron* for *mgron*.
- 16 F, M: insert /.
- 17 D, J: omit /.
- 18 J: *yid* for *yi dam*. N: *yid dam* for *yi dam*. P: *yi da* followed by one space for *yi dam*.
- 19 M: *brten bar* for *brtan par*. A, F: *bar* for *par*.
- 20 A, J: / for //.

des 'di ltar bdag gis gdol^f pa¹ lta bu dang
/2 lus dang^g sems gtsang^h mar bya'i³ kha
zas kyis lus gtsangⁱ mar ni^j mi^k bya'o //

de ci'i phyir zhe na /4 zas bzang po ji⁵
snyed⁶ cig^l zos kyang⁷ de thams cad^m ni
tha marⁿ mgag tu zag go /8 tha mar mi^o
'thun⁹ no^p //9 tha mar dri nga ba'o //r de
lta^s bas^t na bdag gis¹⁰ bzang po 'dod
par¹¹ mi^u bya'o¹² snyam du bslab par
bya'o //13

caṇḍālakumārasaḍṣeṇa mayā bhavi-
tavyaṁ / cittakāyacaṇḍeṇa / na
bhojanacaṇḍeṇa / <Śikṣ 129.16-130.1>
tat kasmād dhetoḥ / kiyat praṇītam api
bhojanaṁ bhuktaṁ / sarvaṁ tatpūṭiniṣya-
ndaparyavasānaṁ durgandhaparyava-
sānaṁ pratikūlaparyavasānaṁ / tasmān
mayā na praṇītabhojanākāṅkṣiṇā
bhavitavyaṁ / <Śikṣ 130.1-3>

VI.3 A 387a9, B 174b2, D 170a4, F 227b2, J 183b4, L 188a4, M 230b3, N 291a3, P 167a5, S
276a4; Śikṣ D 74b3, P 87a6:

de de^a ltar^b shin^c tu^d nges par^e sems pa'i sems kyis grong ngam /14 grong khyer ram¹⁵
/16 grong rdal du bsod snyoms^f kyi phyir 'jug pa na¹⁷ mthar chags su¹⁸ bslang bar^g
bya'o //19

- 1 D, J, Śikṣ D, P: *bu* for *pa*. B, P: *ba* for *pa*.
- 2 F, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 3 F: *bya'o* // for *bya'i*. A, L, M, S: insert / after *bya'i*.
- 4 F: // for /. B, F, P: insert *kha* after /.
- 5 F, M: *ci* for *ji*.
- 6 B: *ste* for *snyed*. F: *ryned* for *snyed*. P: *snyed* very cramped and unclear, plus one space.
- 7 D, J: *pa* for *kyang*.
- 8 A, Śikṣ D: // for /.
- 9 J, N, S, Śikṣ D, P: *mithun* for *'thun*.
- 10 Śikṣ D, P: insert *zas*.
- 11 Śikṣ P: *pa* for *par*.
- 12 A, P: insert /. B, L: insert //.
- 13 A: / for //. Śikṣ P: omits //. Śikṣ D, P: insert *de bzhin du sbyar ro* // [= *peyālam*].
- 14 A, B, M, N, P: omit /. F: omits *grong ngam* /.
- 15 B: omits *ram*. P: *ram*.
- 16 F, M, N, P: omit /.
- 17 B, F, L, P: insert /.
- 18 F, L, M: *chagsu*.
- 19 A, F: / for //.

des 'di ltar sems bskyed par bya ste /^h
 bdag laⁱ skyes pa bsod snyoms^j ster gyi¹
 bud med^k ni ma yin no¹ zhe² 'am / bdag
 la bud med^m bsodⁿ snyoms ster gyi³
 skyes pa^o ni ma yin no^p zhe 'am / bdag la
 khye'u bsod snyoms ster gyi⁴ bu mo ni
 ma yin no^q zhe 'am / bdag la bu mo bsod
 snyoms ster⁵ gyi⁶ khye'u ni ma yin no^r
 zhe 'am /

bdag gis^s bzang po rnyed kyi⁷ ngan^t pa
 ni ma yin no^u zhe 'am / bdag gis bsti⁸
 stang⁹ du^v byas nas rnyed kyi¹⁰ bsti¹¹
 stang du¹² ma byas par^w ni^x ma yin no^y
 zhe 'am /^z bdag gis bde blag tu¹³ rnyed
 kyi¹⁴ sha thang bar ni^{aa} ma yin no¹⁵ zhe
 'am /

bdag la^{ab} skyes pa¹⁶ dang^{ac} /¹⁷ bud
 med^{ad} dang /¹⁸ khye'u dang /¹⁹ bu mo
 bsu²⁰ bar 'gyur ro²¹ zhe 'am /^{ae}

tena naivam cittam utpādayitavyam /
 puruṣo me piṇḍapātām dadāti na strīḥ /
 strī me piṇḍapātām dadāti na puruṣaḥ /
 dāriko me piṇḍapātām dadāti na dārikā /
 dārikā me piṇḍapātām dadāti na dārikāḥ /
 <Śikṣ 130.3-5>

praṇītam labhe 'ham na lūham / satkṛtya
 labhe 'ham nāsatkṛtya / capalam labhe
 'ham na kṛcchreṇa <Śikṣ 130.5-6>

pratyudgaccheyur mām stripuruṣa-
 dārakadārikāḥ / <Śikṣ 130.8>

- 1 F, M, S: insert /.
- 2 F, L: *zhes* for *zhe*.
- 3 A: *kyi* for *gyi*. F, M, S: insert /.
- 4 A, P: *kyi* for *gyi*. F, M, S: insert /.
- 5 B: omits *ster*. P: *snyoms ster* cramped.
- 6 B, P: *kyi* for *gyi*. F, M, S: insert /.
- 7 Śikṣ P: *kyis* for *kyi*. F, S: insert /.
- 8 A, B, F, J, P: *sti* for *bsti*.
- 9 B, F: *sting* for *stang*.
- 10 Śikṣ P: *kyis* for *kyi*. F, M, S: insert /.
- 11 A, B, F, J, P: *sti* for *bsti*.
- 12 B, L, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit *du*.
- 13 B, F, N, P: *du* for *tu*.
- 14 M, S: insert /.
- 15 F, M: *yino*.
- 16 D, J, N, S: *ba* for *pa*.
- 17 B, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 18 B, N, P: omit /.
- 19 B, M, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 20 A: *su* for *bsu*. B: *scu* [for *stsu*?] for *bsu*. P: *mo bscu* [*bstsu*?] cramped. Śikṣ D: *rtsi* for *bsu*.
- Śikṣ P: *mos su* for *mo bsu*.
- 21 F, L, M, N: 'gyuro. F inserts // after 'gyuro.

phyin ma thag tu ¹ sems par ^{af} 'gyur ram ^{ag} /ah	praviṣṭamātram ca mām samanvāhareyuh / <Śikṣ 130.6>
bdag ^{ai} sdod ^{aj} dgos par 'gyur ram ^{ak} /	na me kaścid vikṣepo bhavet / <Śikṣ 130.6-7>
shin ^{al} tu ^{am} bsdogs ^{an} pa rnyed par 'gyur ram ^{ao} / bdag gis kha zas ² bzang ^{ap} po ^{aq} ro sna tshogs dang ldan pa ³ rnyed par 'gyur ^{ar} gyi ⁴ dbul po ⁱ⁵ zas lta bu ngan pa ^{as} ni ⁶ rnyed pa ^{at} ma yin no ^{au} snyam du ⁷	sunihitārṇ labhe 'ham praṇītān nānā- rasāṁ labhe 'ham / na hīnadaridra- bhojanārṇ labhe 'ham <Śikṣ 130.7-8>
deś ^{av} mi ^{aw} dge ba ⁱ⁸ yid la byed pa thams cad ^{ax} bskyed par mi ^{ay} bya'o // ⁹	ime te sarve 'kuśalā manasikārā notpādayitavyaḥ // pe // <Śikṣ 130.8-9>

VI.4 A 387b1, B 174b8, D 170b1, F 227b7, J 184a2, L 188a8, M 230b8, N 291b2, P 167b2, S 276b4; Śikṣ D 74b6, P 87b2:

'di lta bu'i go cha^a bgo bar yang bya ste / rnyed pa ma rnyed kyang yongs su¹⁰ yi^b chad
par mi^c bya ba dang / ngan pa dang bzang po'i 'du shes bskyed par mi^d bya ba 'di ni dge
slong bsod snyoms¹¹ pa dag^e gi chos nyid do^f //g de ci'i phyir zhe na /
sems can¹² phal cher ni ro la brkam^h ste prāyeṇa hi satvā rasagrddhā bhojana-
/13 zas kyi phyir sdig pa'i las rnams byasⁱ hetoḥ pāpāni karmāṇi kṛtvā narakeṣū-
nas¹⁴ /15 sems canⁱ dmyal ba rnams su¹⁶ papadyante / <Śikṣ 130.9-10>
skye'o //k

- 1 F: *du* for *tu*. Śikṣ D, P: insert *bdag la*.
- 2 Śikṣ D, P: omit *kha zas*.
- 3 A, F, M: : *ba* for *pa*.
- 4 A, F, L, M, S: insert /.
- 5 J: *pa'i* for *po'i*. B, F, P: insert *kha*.
- 6 D, J: omit *ni*.
- 7 B, P: insert /.
- 8 Śikṣ D, P: *dga' ba* for *dge ba'i*.
- 9 A: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: insert *de bzhin du sbyar te* / [= *peyālam*].
- 10 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 11 D, J: insert *spyod*.
- 12 M: *seṁn*. B, P: insert *la*.
- 13 N, Śikṣ P: omit /.
- 14 B, P: *na* for *nas*.
- 15 A, D, J, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 16 Śikṣ D, P: *bar* for *ba rnams su*. L, M: *rnamsu*.

gang dag chog¹ shes pa² mi^l brkam^m paⁿ
 /³ ma zhen^o pa⁴ /⁵ ro la mi^p gdu⁶ ba /⁷
 lce'i dbang po chog shes pa^q /⁸ zas ngan
 ngon^r ji⁹ tsam gyis kyang^s 'tsho ba de
 dag^t ni¹⁰ shi^u 'phos te¹¹ /¹² shi^v ba'i dus
 byas nas mtho ris su¹³ skye bar 'gyur^w /^x
 lha dang mi^y mams kyiz nang du bde
 'gror 'gro^{aa} bar 'gyur /^{ab} lhar skyes nas
 bdud^{ac} rtsi za bar 'gyur ro¹⁴ //^{ad}

ye ye punaḥ sarītuṣṭā agrddhā alolupā
 rasapratiprasrabdhā jihvendriyasarī-
 tuṣṭāḥ kiyal lūhenāpi bhojanena jāpayanti
 / teṣāṁ cyutānāṁ kālagatānāṁ svargo-
 papattir bhavati / sugatigamanāṁ bhavati
 devamanuṣyeṣu / te devopapannāḥ
 sudhāḥ paribhuñjate / <Śikṣ 130.10-12>

VI.5 A 387b4, B 175a4, D 170b3, F 228a3, J 184a4, L 188b3, M 231a3, N 291b5, P 167b5, S 277a1; Śikṣ D 74b7, P 87b4:

'od srung¹⁵ de ltar na bsod snyoms
 spyod pa'i dge slong gis^a ro la sred pa
 bzlog^b ste /¹⁶ sems nges par sems^c pas^d
 lhad¹⁷ zan zhag bdun^e lon^f pa¹⁸ za yang^g
 yi¹⁹ chad^h par miⁱ bya'o //^j

evam kāśyapa piṇḍacārikeṇa bhikṣuṇā
 rasatṛṣṇāṁ vinivartayitvā nidhyapta-
 cittena suparipakvān kulmāsān pari-
 bhuñjatā na paritaptavyam / <Śikṣ 130.12-
 14>

- 1 A: *chos* for *chog*. B: omits *chog*. P: *gang dag chog* cramped.
- 2 N: inserts *dang*. S: *par* for *pa*. D, J, N: insert /.
- 3 A, F, M, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 4 D, J, P: insert *dang*. P: *ma zhen pa dang* cramped.
- 5 A, B, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 6 N, Śikṣ P: *gdung* for *gdu*.
- 7 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 8 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 9 F, L, M, N: *ci* for *ji*.
- 10 M, N: omit *ni*.
- 11 B, P: *ste* for *te*.
- 12 N, S, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 13 F, L: *risu*.
- 14 F, M, N: *'gyuro*.
- 15 S, Śikṣ D, P: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 16 D, J: omit /.
- 17 B, D, M, N, S: *lhag* for *lhad*. P: *ltad* for *lhad*.
- 18 A, F: *ba* for *pa*.
- 19 J, N, Śikṣ P: *yid* for *yi*.

de ci'i phyir zhe na / lus gso^k ba dang /¹ tat kasmād dhetoḥ / kāyasaṁdhāraṇā-
 'phags pa'i lam gyi tshogs¹ bsags² pa'i rthaṁ mārgasaṁdhāraṇārthaṁ mayā
 don du³ bdag gis^m zas bza'oⁿ snyam bhojanaṁ paribhoktavyaṁ // pe // <Śikṣ
 pa'i⁴ phyir ro⁵ //⁶ 130.14-15>

VI.6 A 387b5, B 175a5, D 170b4, F 228a5, J 184a6, L 188b4, M 231a5, N 291b7, P 167b6, S 277a3:

'od srung^a bsod snyoms spyod pa'i dge slong gis⁷ lhung bzed^b du 'ongs⁸ pa / lhung
 bzed^c du chud pa /⁹ chos dang ldan pa / chos kyis¹⁰ rnyed^d pa /¹¹ tshangs pa mtshungs
 par^e spyod pa'i dge slong dag dang¹² thun^f mong^g du byas la bza' bar bya'o //^h

VI.7 A 387b5, B 175a7, D 170b5, F 228a6, J 184a7, L 188b5, M 231a6, N 292a1, P 167b7, S 277a4:

'od srung^a gal te^b dge slong^c bsod snyoms spyod pa na bar^d gyur^e te / nad g-yog med^f
 la^g bsod snyoms la¹³ 'jug kyang mi^h nus na / desⁱ 'di snyam du bdag ni grogs med^j pa¹⁴ /
 bdag ni gcig puk^k gnyis su^l med^m pa /¹⁵ bdag ni rab tu byung baⁿ /¹⁶ bdag gi^o grogs¹⁷ ni
 chos¹⁸ yin¹⁹ te / bdag ni^p chos la rton²⁰ pa^q yin la^r /²¹ bdag ni mi^s bde zhing sdug bsngal
 te²² rab tu na bas /²³ de bzhin gshegs pas chos^t kyi sman gsungs pa gang yin pa²⁴ de^u ji^v

- 1 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 2 A, B: *bsags* for *bsags*. N, Śikṣ P: *bsag* for *bsags*.
- 3 A, B, F, L, P: *tu* for *du*.
- 4 F, M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 5 F, M: *phyiro*.
- 6 A: / for //. Śikṣ D, P: insert *de bzhin du sbyar te* / [= *peyālam*].
- 7 D, F: *gi* for *gis*.
- 8 B: *'os* for *'ongs*. P: *'ongs* cramped.
- 9 A, D, J, L: omit /.
- 10 D, J: *kyi* for *kyis*.
- 11 F, N: omit /.
- 12 B, P: omit *dang*. A: inserts /.
- 13 F, M: *snyomsu* for *snyoms la*.
- 14 D, J: *la* for *pa*.
- 15 N, S: omit /.
- 16 A, F: omit / . N: // for /.
- 17 D, J, P: insert *po*.
- 18 B: omits *chos* (See next).
- 19 P: *po ni chos yin* very cramped (See previous).
- 20 A: *rtond* for *rton*. B: *rten* for *rton*. L: *ston* for *rton*. N: unclear, but *rten?* *brten?* for *rton*.
- 21 A, L: omit /.
- 22 M, N, S: insert /.
- 23 A, D, J, N, S: omit /.
- 24 A, F, M: : *ba* for *pa*.

ltar thos ba¹ bzhin du² chos de dag bdag gis tshul bzhin^w brtag par bya'o³ snyam du
sems bskyed par bya'o //x

VI.8 A 387b7, B 175b1, D 170b7, F 228b1, J 184b1, L 188b7, M 231b1, N 292a3, P 168a2, S
277a7:

'od srung^a de la gang lus 'di la yang dag pa ji^b lta ba^c bzhin du^d so sor rtog pa 'di ni tshul
bzhin la sbyor^e ba'o^f // de lus 'di la skyon du yang dag pa ji^g lta ba^h bzhinⁱ dui so sor rtog
pa na⁴ tshul bzhin la zhugs pa de /⁵ sems rtse^k gcig tu 'gyur zhing dran pa⁶ dang ldan la^l
/ shes bzhin dang ldan pas⁸ bsam gtan dang po bskyed pa'i^m gnas gang yin ba⁹ de yod
par 'gyurⁿ te / des^o bsam gtan thob nas¹⁰ bsam gtan gyi bde^p ba 'dod^q pa na /¹¹ nyi ma
gcig gam /^r nyi ma gnyis sam^s / nyi ma gsum nas^t nyi ma bdun^u gyi bar du bsam gtan
gyi bde ba'i zas kyis gnas so¹² //v gal te 'di ltar mal 'byor^w la zhugs pa¹³ bsam gtan
bskyed^x par mi^y nus na /¹⁴ de ltar brtson zhing mnal 'byor^z spyod pa'i dge slong chos^{aa} la
gnas pa de la¹⁵ mngon par¹⁶ shes pa mngon par¹⁷ shes pa'i lha dang /¹⁸ klu^{ab} dang /¹⁹
gnod sbyin dag kha zas 'bul bar 'gyur ro²⁰ // de ci'i phyir^{ac} zhe na / 'di ni mnal 'byor^{ad}
spyod pa^{ae} mams kyia^f rgyu^{ag} 'thun²¹ pa²² ste / des^{ah} lhas yongs su²³ bzung²⁴ ba rnyed
pa'i phyir ro²⁵ //ai

- 1 B, L, M, P: *pa* for *ba*. F: omits *ba*.
- 2 B, P, S: insert /.
- 3 B: inserts //. P: inserts /.
- 4 L: *ni* for *na*. A, S: insert /.
- 5 A, D, J, N, S: omit /.
- 6 A, F, M: : *ba* for *pa*.
- 7 B, L, N, P: omit /.
- 8 A, M: *bas* for *pas*. B, L, P: insert /.
- 9 B, M, P, S: *pa* for *ba*.
- 10 M, S: insert /.
- 11 D, J, N: omit /.
- 12 F, L, M: *gnaso*.
- 13 L: *pas* for *pa*. N, S: *la* for *pa*. B, P, S: insert /.
- 14 B, N, P: omit /.
- 15 B, L, N, P: insert /.
- 16 A, M: *bar* for *par*. F: *pas* for *par*.
- 17 A, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 18 B, F, N, P: omit /.
- 19 B, F, L, N, P: omit /.
- 20 F, M: *'gyuro*.
- 21 F, L, N, S: *mithun* for *'thun*.
- 22 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 23 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 24 M, S: *gzung* for *bzung*.
- 25 F, L, M: *phyiro*.

VI.9 A 387b11, B 175b7, D 171a3, F 228b5, J 184b6, L 189a4, M 231b6, N 292b1, P 168a6, S 277b5; Śikṣ D 75a2, P 87b6:

'od srung¹ gal te sprin 'dus shing char
'bab² ste /³ bsod snyoms spyod pa'i dge
slong⁴ bsod snyoms la 'jug mi^a nus pa'i
dus kyib^b tshe⁵ byams pa'i zas kyi go
bgos^c te^d / chos sems pa^e yid la⁶ byed pa
la gnas nas /⁷ zhag gnyis sam /⁸ zhag^f
gsum zhig zan chad na /⁹ 'di ltar yi dags^g
gshin rje'i 'jig rten pa^h nyes pa'i byed pa'i
las byas pa gang dag lo'i brgyar yang
mchil ma¹⁰ thal ba¹¹ 'ga^k bzar^l mi myed
pa^m dag kyang yod deⁿ /^o
de lta bas na bdag tshul bzhin du^p chos
sems pa la gnas pas /¹² lus^q nyam chung
ba'am^r /¹³ sems nyam chung ba¹⁴
bskyed¹⁵ par mi bya ste / bkres pa dang^s
skom pas^t ji¹⁶ mi snyam par¹⁷ bya'o //¹⁸

yadi punaḥ kāśyapa piṇḍacāriko bhikṣur
meghākulavṛṣṭikālasamaye vartamāne na
śaknuyāt piṇḍāyāvatarturṇ / tena maitry-
āhārasaṁnaddhena dharmacittamana-
sikāra¹ pratiṣṭhitena dvirātraṁ trirātraṁ vā
bhaktacchadacchinnena evaṁ saṁjñō-
tpādayitavyā / santi yāmalaupikāḥ pretā
duṣkarakarmakāriṇo ye varṣāsatena
khetapiṇḍam apy āhāraṁ na pratilabhante
/ <Śikṣ 130.15-18> ¹) Bendall misprints
°cittā°.

tan mayā dharmayoniśaś cintāpratiṣṭhi-
tena kāyadaurbalyaṁ vā cittadaurbalyaṁ
vā notpādayitavyaṁ / adhivāsayiṣyāmi
kṣutpipāsāṁ / <Śikṣ 130.18-20>

- 1 S, Śikṣ P: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 2 A, L, P: *bab* for *'bab*. B: *ba pa* for *'bab*.
- 3 D, J, N: omit /.
- 4 D, J: insert *la*.
- 5 A, F, L, M, S, Śikṣ D, P: insert /.
- 6 A: folio 87b end here. A resumes at VII.20.
- 7 Śikṣ P: omits *nas*. F, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 8 M: omits *sam* and / . B, F, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 9 F, M: omit /.
- 10 N, Śikṣ D, P: *ma'i* for *ma*.
- 11 B, F: *pa* for *ba*.
- 12 D, J, N: omit /.
- 13 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 14 F, M: *bar* for *ba*.
- 15 F, M, Śikṣ D, P: *skyed* for *bskyed*.
- 16 F, M: *ci* for *ji*.
- 17 F, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 18 B: *pa'o //* for *par bya'o //*. P: *par bya'o* and first / cramped.

'phags pa'i lam bsgom^u pa¹ la brtson² na punar āryamārgabhāvanāyām vīryam
'grus^v rgyun mi chad³ par^w bya'o⁴ sramsayiṣyāmi // pe // <Śikṣ 130.20>
snyam du⁵ 'du shes bskyed par bya'o //6

VI.10 B 176a3, D 171a5, F 229a1, J 185a1, L 189a7, M 232a1, N 292b5, P 168b2, S 278a3;
Śikṣ D 75a4, P 88a1:

'od srung^a dge slong bsod snyoms spyod pas^b khyim^c 'dris pa dang /^d skyes pa 'dris pa
dang / bud med 'dris pa dang / khye'u 'dris pa dang /^e bu mo 'dris par mi bya'o //^f
khyim gang na bsod^g snyoms gtsang ma yatra kule piṇḍapātāṃ śucirṃ kārayet tatra
byed pa'i khyim der stan^h la 'dug ste // kule āsane niṣadya dharmikathā kartavyā
/ <Śikṣ 130.20-131.1>
bsod snyoms gtsangⁱ ma byed pa' zin yāvan na sa piṇḍapātāḥ śucīkṛto bhavet
gyi^k bar du chos kyi^l gtam^m brjod par <Śikṣ 131.1-2>
bya'o //
de nas bsodⁿ snyoms de blangs la stan^o tena piṇḍapātāṃ gṛhītvā utthāyāsanāt
las langs te⁸ 'gro bar bya'o // prakramitavyam / <Śikṣ 131.2>

VI.11 B 176a5, D 171a7, F 229a3, J 185a3, L 189a8, M 232a3, N 292b6, P 168b3, S 278a5;
Śikṣ D 75a5, P 88a2:

'od srung⁹ bsod snyoms spyod¹⁰ pa'i dge piṇḍacārikeṇa kāśyapa bhikṣuṇā nāva-
slong gis mkhong¹¹ bar¹² mi bya /^a kha bhāsakareṇa bhavitavyam na lapanā na
gsag mi bya /¹³ tshul 'chos¹⁴ par mi kuhanā kartavyā // <Śikṣ 131.2-3>
bya'o //15

- 1 D, J, P [cramped]: *par bya ba* for *pa*. F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 2 P: *la brtson* cramped (see previous note).
- 3 D, J, N, Śikṣ D, P: '*chad* for *chad*.
- 4 B, P: insert //.
- 5 B, P: *pa* for *du*.
- 6 Śikṣ D, P: insert *de bzhin du sbyar te* / [= *peyālam*].
- 7 D, J, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 8 B: inserts /. P: one space.
- 9 S, Śikṣ D, P: *srungs* for *srung*.
- 10 B: omits *spyod*. P: *spyod* and following *pa'i* cramped, with one space after *pa'i*.
- 11 B, F: *mkhang* for *mkhong*. D, J, N, Śikṣ D, P: '*khong* for *mkhong*.
- 12 M, Śikṣ P: *par* for *bar*.
- 13 B: omits *kha gsag mi bya* / (see below). P: *bya'o //* for *bya /*. F: // for /.
- 14 D, J, N: *bcos* for '*chos*.
- 15 P: *kha gsag mi bya'o // tshul 'chos par mi bya'o //* fit into a space of twelve letters (see above).

de la mkhong ¹ ba ² gang zhe na / gang ^b	tatra katamo 'vabhāsaḥ / yat pareṣāṁ
gzhan ^c dag la tshig 'di skad ³ smra ba ste /	evaṁ vācāṁ bhāṣate / <Śikṣ 131.4>
bdag gi bsod snyoms ni ngan pa'o // ⁴	lūho me piṇḍapāto rukṣo me piṇḍapāto
bdag gi bsod snyoms ni rtsub pa'o // ^d	āsīn na ca me yāvadarthaṁ bhuktaṁ /
bdag gis ⁵ sngon 'di lta bu dang ma	bahujanasādhāraṇaś ca me piṇḍapātaḥ
'drangs ⁶ par ma zos ^e so ⁷ // bdag gi ^f bsod	kṛtaḥ / alpaṁ me bhuktaṁ jighatsito
snyoms ^g ni skye bo mang po dang thun	'smīti / <Śikṣ 131.4-6>
mong du byas so ⁸ // ^h bdag gis nyung	
zhig zos te // ⁱ bdag ma 'drangs ¹⁰ pas bdag	
gi ⁱ lus nyam chung ngoj zhes bya ba ste	
/11	
'di ltar mkhong ¹² ba'i ¹³ mtshan ma gang	yat kiñcid evaṁrūpaṁ avabhāsanimittāṁ
ci yang ^k rung ba 'di lta bu 'di ^l ni sems	/ iyam ucyate cittakuhanā / sarvaṁ etat
kyi ^m tshul 'chos pa zhes bya ste / dge	piṇḍacārikeṇa bhikṣuṇā na kartavyaṁ /
slong bsod snyoms ⁿ spyod pas de dag	<Śikṣ 131.6-7>
thams cad mi bya'o //	
	[upekṣakabhūtena /] <Śikṣ 131.7>

VI.12 B 176b1, D 171b2, F 229a6, J 185a6, L 189b3, M 232a6, N 293a3, P 168b6, S 278b1;
Śikṣ D 75a7, P 88a5:

- 1 B, F: *mkhang* for *mkhong*. D, J, N, Śikṣ D, P: *'khong* for *mkhong*.
- 2 B, L, M, Śikṣ P: *pa* for *ba*.
- 3 F, N: insert *ces*. Śikṣ D: inserts *du*.
- 4 M: omits *bdag gi bsod snyoms ni ngan pa'o //*. Śikṣ D, P: / for //.
- 5 B, P: *gi* for *gis*.
- 6 D, N, S, Śikṣ D: *'grangs* for *'drangs*.
- 7 L, M: *zoso*.
- 8 F, L, M: *byaso*.
- 9 F, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 10 D, N, S, Śikṣ D: *'grangs* for *'drangs*.
- 11 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 12 B: *mkhang* for *mkhong*. D, J, N, Śikṣ D, P: *'khong* for *mkhong*. M: *ma* added in margin at start of line in same hand.
- 13 B, P, Śikṣ P: *pa'i* for *ba'i*.

gang lhung bzed ^a du 'ongs pa ngan	yat pātre patitaṃ lūhaṃ vā praṇitaṃ vā
kyang rung / ¹ bzang yang rung / ² nyung	śubhaṃ vāśubhaṃ vā tat paribhokta-
yang rung / ³ mang ^b yang rung / ⁴ gtsang	vyam <Śikṣ 131.7-8>
yang rung ^c / ⁵ mi gtsang ^d yang rung ste / ⁶	
de ⁷ bza' bar bya'o // ⁸	
yongs su ⁹ gdung ba med pa dang / bsam	aparitapyamānenāśayaśuddhena dharma-
pa ¹⁰ yongs su ¹¹ dag pa dange ^e / ^f chos	nidhyaptibahulena / <Śikṣ 131.8>
nges par sems pa mang ba dang /	
lus gso ^g ba dang / ¹² 'phags pa'i lam nye	kāyajāpanārtham āryamārgasyopa-
bar brtan ¹³ pa'i ^h phyir ¹⁴ des bsod	stambhārthaṃ sa piṇḍapātaḥ pari-
snyoms bza' bar bya'o // ⁱ	bhoktavaya[h] // <Śikṣ 131.8-9>

VI.13 B 176b3, D 171b3, F 229a8, J 185a7, L 189b5, M 232a8, N 293a5, P 168b8, S 278b4:
 'od srunga^a gal te dge slong^b bsod snyoms spyod^c pas^d grong ngam /¹⁵ grong khyer ram
 /^e grong rdal du bsod snyoms bslangs¹⁶ te^f ma rnyed la^g /¹⁷ ji^h ltar lhung bzed bkrus
 pa¹⁸ bzhin du phyir byung na /¹⁹ des de bzhin gshegs pa yid la bya ste / de bzhin gshegs
 pa'i bsod nams²⁰ kyi gzji brjid kyi brjid^k pa^l / 'khor los^m sgyurⁿ ba'i^o rgyal srid spangs^p

- 1 F, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 2 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 3 F, M, N, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 4 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 5 F, M, N, P, Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 6 D, J, Śikṣ D: omit /.
- 7 F, Śikṣ P: omit *de*.
- 8 B, F: / for //.
- 9 F, L, M: *yongsu*.
- 10 F, M: *ba* for *pa*
- 11 F, L, M: *yongsu*.
- 12 Śikṣ D, P: omit /.
- 13 D: *brten* for *brtan*. N, S, Śikṣ D, P: *bstan* for *brtan*.
- 14 F, M, S: insert /.
- 15 B, F, M, N, P: omit /.
- 16 B, F, L, M, P: *blangs* for *bslangs*.
- 17 B, F, P: omit /.
- 18 F, M: omit *pa*.
- 19 F, N: omit /.
- 20 B, L: *snyoms* for *nams*.

nas¹ rab tu byung ba² /³ lha dang /⁴ klu dang /⁵ gnod sbyin dang^q /⁶ dri zas mchod pa^r /⁷
 mi dge ba'i chos thams cad spangs pa / dge ba'i chos thams cad dang ldan pa^s /⁸ nyon
 mongs pa thams cad dang bral^t ba⁹ de nyid^u grong du bsod snyoms kyi phyir gshegs na
 yang¹⁰ ji^v ltar lhung bzed bkrus pa^w bzhin^x du slar gshegs na /^y bdag lta bu^z bsod nams
 chung ba¹¹ /^{aa} dge ba'i rtas ba ma bskyed pa¹² ji¹³ ltar lhung bzed bkrus pa bzhin du
 phyir byung bas¹⁴ ci'i phyir^{ab} yia^c chad par^{ad} bya¹⁵ / de ci'i phyir zhe na / dge ba'i rtas ba
 ma bskyed pas¹⁶ kha zas bzang po dag mi myed pa'i^{ae} phyir ro^{af} //

VI. 14 B 176b7, D 171b6, F 229b5, J 185b3, L 189b8, M 232b4, N 293b2, P 169a4, S 279a2:
 gal te bdud^a kyi las sam^b / bdud kyi byin gyi^c rlab^s¹⁷ kyis bram ze dang¹⁸ khyim bdag
 de dag bdag la bsod snyoms mi ster na / ci nas bdud^d bzhi las yang dag par 'das pa dang
 / nyon mongs pa thams cad dang bral bar 'gyur ba de ltar bya'o snyam du bsam mo^e //^f
 de ltar nga'i^g nan tan la gnas pa de la bdud dang^h bdud kyi ris kyi lha nmams kyisⁱ glags
 rnyed par mi 'gyur te / 'od srung^j dge slong bsod snyoms spyod pas¹⁹ de ltar 'phags pa'i
 rigs nmams yongs su²⁰ sbyang^k bar bya'o //

¹ bsod snyoms spyod^m pa'i le'u steⁿ drug pa'o //

- 1 B, F, M, P: insert /.
- 2 B, P: *na* for *ba*.
- 3 B, F, L, N: omit /. (P: end of line, and hard to tell, but seems to have a *shad*.)
- 4 B, F, N, P: omit /.
- 5 B, F, P: omit /.
- 6 B, N, P: omit /.
- 7 F, L, M: omit /.
- 8 D, J: omit /.
- 9 F, N: insert /.
- 10 S: *na'ang* for *na yang*. B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 11 D, J: insert *dang*. M has a space of two letters before /, so perhaps *dang* was erased. P: *ba dang* /
 is obviously an insertion and correction.
- 12 B, F, M, P: insert /.
- 13 F, M: *ci* for *ji*.
- 14 L, M: insert /.
- 15 B, P: 'gyur for *bya*.
- 16 F, L, M: insert /.
- 17 B, F, J, N, P: *brlabs* for *rlabs*.
- 18 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 19 L, M: insert /.
- 20 L, M, N: *yongsu*.

The Tibetan Text: Chapter 7

VII.1 B 177a2, D 172a1, F 229b8, J 185b4, L 190a3, M 232b7, N 293b5, P 169a7, S 279a5:
 //1 'od srung de la dge slong^a phyag dar khrod pa pas² ji^b lta bu'i sems kyis phyag dar
 khrod pa bsdu bar bya zhe na / ngo tsha shes pa dang /³ khrel yod^c pas g-yog⁴ pa'i sems
 su⁵ bya'id /^e chos gos^f kyis cha^g bar sbyor ba^h la brtson pa'i'i sems kyis ni ma yin noj //k
 rlung dang /⁶ nyi ma dang /⁷ sbrang bu dang /⁸ sha sbrang dang /⁹ sdig sbrul gyis reg
 par 'gyur ba^l yongs su¹⁰ bskyab pa'i phyir yin^m gyi¹¹ /¹² lus brgyan pa'i phyirⁿ ni¹³ ma
 yin no^o // de bzhin gshegs pa'i^p gsung rab la nan tan^q gyis gnas pas¹⁴ gos gtsang ma la
 mngon par¹⁵ dga' ba med de / des phyag dar¹⁶ gyi¹⁷ phung po las phyag dar khrod pa
 blangs la¹⁸ 'du shes gnyis bskyed par bya ste / gnyis gang zhe na / chog shes pa'i 'du
 shes¹⁹ dang /²⁰ mgu sla ba'i 'du shes so²¹ //r

VII.2 B 177a6, D 172a3, F 230a4, J 185b8, L 190a6, M 233a3, N 294a1, P 169b2, S 279b2:
 gzhan yang 'du shes gnyis bskyed^a par bya ste / gnyis gang zhe na /^b nga rgyal med pa'i
 'du shes dang / 'phags pa'i rigs la gnas pa'i 'du shes so²² //

VII.3 B 177a7, D 172a4, F 230a5, J 186a1, L 190a6, M 233a4, N 294a2, P 169b3, S 279b2:
 gzhan yang 'du shes gnyis bskyed par bya ste / gnyis gang zhe na / lus brgyan pa dang /
 sems gtsang ba'o^a //

- 1 J, P [beginning of line]: omit //.
- 2 F, L: bas for pas. B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 3 B, L, N, P: omit /.
- 4 B, N: g-yogs for g-yog.
- 5 F, L: semsu.
- 6 B, L, N, P: omit /.
- 7 B, J, N, P: omit /.
- 8 B, L, P: omit /.
- 9 B, N, P: omit /.
- 10 B: omits yongs su. F, L, N: yongsu.
- 11 B: la for gyi. F: bgyi for yin gyi. P: omits yin gyi. M: gyis for gyi.
- 12 D, J: omit /. F: // for /.
- 13 M, N: omit ni.
- 14 F, M, S: insert /.
- 15 F, M: bar for par.
- 16 B, F, P: insert khrod.
- 17 B, P: kyī for gyi. F: kyis for gyi.
- 18 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 19 B, P: insert pa.
- 20 B, P: // for /.
- 21 F, L, N: sheso.
- 22 F, L, M, N: sheso.

VII.4 B 177a8, D 172a4, F 230a6, J 186a1, L 190a7, M 233a5, N 294a3, P 169b3, S 279b3:
 'od srung^a gal te dge slong phyag dar khrod pa^b pas^c phyag dar^d gyi^e phung po las
 phyag dar khrod pa¹ len pa^f na /² sa phyogs de na sngon gnyen^g bshes su³ gyur pa^h 'am
 / sngon gtam 'dres pa 'am / phebs par smra baⁱ de dag gis mthong na⁴ bdag la smod par
 'gyur gyis^j dogs te⁵ phyag dar khrod pa⁶ de ma blangs na /^k 'od srung^l dge slong^m phyag
 dar khrod pa paⁱ phyag dar khrod paⁿ de lta bu ni^o yongs su⁷ dag pa ma yin no^p zhes
 ngas bshad do^q // de ciⁱ phyir zhe na / dge slong phyag dar khrod pa pas⁸ rdo⁹ lta buⁱ
 sems dang / rdo rje lta buⁱ sems kyis dogs pa med par phyag dar khrod pa blang bar
 bya^r baⁱ phyir ro¹⁰ //

VII.5 B 177b3, D 172a6, F 230b1, J 186a4, L 190b1, M 233a7, N 294a6, P 169b6, S 279b6:
 des phyag dar khrod pa de blangs nas¹¹ legs par bkrus te¹² shin tu^a gtsang^b zhing^c dri
 ma med par byas la /¹³ tshon¹⁴ btsal te kha^d legs par bsgyur la¹⁵ chos gos snam sbyar la
 glan¹⁶ par^e bya'o // de¹⁷ phyis 'jig^f par mi 'gyur^g bar^h legs par glan¹⁸ legsⁱ par sbyar /
 legs par btsems te^j bgo bar bya'o //

VII.6 B 177b5, D 172a7, F 230b2, J 186a5, L 190b3, M 233b1, N 294a7, P 169b7, S 280a1:
 'od srungs^a dge slong phyag dar^b khrod pa^c pas¹⁹ 'dod chags nye bar zhi bar^d bya baⁱ
 phyir²⁰ mi sdug pa^e yid la bya ba la²¹ gnas la²² phyag dar khrod pa dag lus la bgo^f bar

- 1 F, N: omit *pa*.
- 2 D, J: omit /.
- 3 F, M: *bshesu*.
- 4 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 5 F, M, N: insert /.
- 6 F, M: omit *pa*.
- 7 F, N: *yongsu*.
- 8 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 9 B, D, J, P: insert *rje*. This reading is to be rejected, supported by the Chinese reading "stone."
- 10 F, M: *phyiro*.
- 11 B, M, P: insert /.
- 12 L, M, N, S: insert /.
- 13 D, J: omit /.
- 14 B, P: *mtshon* for *tshon*.
- 15 F, M: insert /.
- 16 B, L, M, N, P: *kla*n for *glan*.
- 17 F, N: *des* for *de*.
- 18 B, F, M: *kla*n for *glan*. F, M, N, S: insert /.
- 19 L, M: insert /.
- 20 B, L, M, P: insert /.
- 21 D, J: *bas* for *ba la*.
- 22 F, M, S: insert /.

bya'o // zhe sdang nye bar zhi bar bya ba'i phyir¹ /¹ byams pa'i sems kyis phyag dar^h
 khrod pa dag lus la bgo bar bya'o // gti mug nye bar zhi bar bya² ba'i phyir³ rten cing
 'brel par⁴ 'byungⁱ ba la gnas te /⁵ phyag dar khrod pa dag lus la bgo bar bya'o // nyon
 mongs pa thams cadi spang ba'i phyir⁶ tshul bzhin⁷ yid la byed ba⁸ la zhugs pas⁹ phyag
 dar khrod pa dag lus la bgo bar bya'o // ^k skye mched drug yongs su¹⁰ shes par bya ba'i
 phyir¹¹ dbang po legs par bsdams te¹² phyag dar khrod pa dag lus la bgo bar bya'o // lha
 dang¹³ klu dang¹⁴ gnod sbyin dag mgu bar bya ba'i phyir^l /¹⁵ tshul 'chos^m pa med pa
 dang /¹⁶ kha gsagⁿ med par^o phyag dar khrod pa dag¹⁷ lus la bgo bar bya'o //

VII.7 B 178a1, D 172b3, F230b6, J 186b1, L 190b6, M233b5, N 294b4, P170a3, S280a5:
 'od srung^a ci'i phyir phyag dar khrod pa zhes bya zhe na / 'od srung^b dper^c na phyag
 dar^d de la ni su yang^e 'dod pa mi skyed^f / su yang^g chags pa mi skyed^h cing¹⁸ yongs
 su¹⁹ mi len teⁱ /²⁰ phyag dar^j ni dor ba'i cha'o // 'od srung^k de bzhin du phyag dar dang^l
 mtshungs par^m bdagⁿ gi med pa /²¹ yongs su²² 'dzin pa med pa /^o myed sla ba²³ /²⁴ mod
 pa /²⁵ gzhan la gsol mi dgos pa /^p gzhan gyi ngor blta^q mi dgos pa /^r gzhan la rag ma
 lus²⁶ pa / phyag dar^s lta bur^t bor ba^u ste / deⁱ^v phyir phyag dar khrod pa^w phyag dar
 khrod pa^x zhes bya'o //

- 1 D, J: omit /.
- 2 M, N: omit *bar bya*.
- 3 P: *bar bya ba'i phyir* cramped. M, S: insert /.
- 4 B, J, P: *bar* for *par*.
- 5 D, J, N: omit /.
- 6 F, M, S: insert /.
- 7 B, P: *khirms* for *bzhin*.
- 8 B, L, N, P, S: *pa* for *ba*.
- 9 M: *bas* for *pas*. F, L, M, S: insert /.
- 10 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 11 B, F, L, P: insert /.
- 12 F, L, M, S: insert /.
- 13 M, S: insert /.
- 14 M, S: insert /.
- 15 D, F, J, N: omit /.
- 16 B, P: omit /.
- 17 B, P: omit *dag*.
- 18 B, P, S: insert /.
- 19 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 20 B, N, P: omit /.
- 21 B, L, N, P: omit /.
- 22 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 23 D, J: *pa* for *ba*.
- 24 L, N: omit /.
- 25 B, N, P: omit /.
- 26 M, S: *las* for *lus*.

VII.8 B 178a4, D 172b4, F 231a1, J 186b3, L 190b8, M 233b8, N 294b6, P 170a6, S 280b1:
 'di ni drang srong^a nams^b kyi^c rigs so¹ // ^d 'di ni 'phags pa nams^e kyi rigs gtsang ma'o^f
 // 'di ni 'phags pa'i^g rigs kyi gnas so² // ³ 'di ni sbyangs^h pa'iⁱ yon tan nams kyi^j rton^k pa'o
 // ^l 'di ni tshul khirms kyi phung po kun^m srung⁴ ba'o⁵ // ⁿ 'di ni ting nge^o 'dzin gyi^p
 phung^q po'i sgo'o // 'di ni shes rab kyi phung po'i rten to⁶ // ⁷ 'di ni nam par^r grol^s ba'i
 phung po⁸ 'byung ba'o^t // ^u 'di ni mam^v par^w grol ba'i^x ye shes mthong ba'i^y phung po
 dang 'thun⁹ pa^z ste / 'od srung^{aa} de ltar phyag dar khrod pa ni yon tan mang ba^{ab} / ^{ac}
 skabs med pa / go skabs med pa^{ad} / ^{ae} bla gab med pa ste / dri ma med^{af} par 'gyur zhing¹⁰
 khur khyer bar 'gyur ba'o^{ag} //

VII.9 B 178a7, D 172b6, F 231a4, J 186b6, L 191a3, M 234a3, N 295a3, P 170a8, S 280b4:
 'od srung^a dge slong phyag dar khrod pa pa¹¹ gang¹² phyag dar khrod¹³ pa'i gos kyi^b
 chog^c par 'dzin pa de la lha nams kyang dga' bar 'gyur ro¹⁴ // 'od srung^d 'di lta bu'i dus
 dang / ¹⁵ 'di lta bu'i man¹⁶ yod de / ^e 'di ltar^f dge slong phyag dar khrod pa pa¹⁷ chos gos
 ngan pa 'chang ba^g / ¹⁸ bsam gtan^h gyi bde ba la snyoms parⁱ zhugs pa de la / ¹⁹ brgya
 byin dang / ²⁰ tshangs pa dang / ²¹ 'jig rten skyong ba nams kyang thal mo sbyorⁱ zhing
 / ²² rkang pa la gtugs te²³ phyag 'tshal bar 'gyur na / ^k lha gzhan phyag 'tshal bar 'gyur ba
 lta ci smos / ^l

- 1 F, L, M, N: *rigso*.
- 2 F, L, M: *gnaso*.
- 3 J, P: / for //.
- 4 L, M, N: *bsrung* for *srung*.
- 5 B, F: *pa'o* for *ba'o*.
- 6 B: *te* for *to*. F, N, S: *no* for *to*. M: *rteno*.
- 7 B, J, P: / for //.
- 8 B, P: *po'i* for *po*.
- 9 L, N, S: *mithun* for *'thun*.
- 10 L, S: insert /.
- 11 M, N, S: *ni* for *pa*.
- 12 M, S: insert /. F: inserts *yin*.
- 13 B, P: omit *pa pa gang phyag dar khrod* (haplography).
- 14 F, L, M, N: *'gyuro*.
- 15 F, N, S: omit /. (Is F erased?)
- 16 B: *phan yon* for *man*. P: *phan* (plus half-space) for *man*. M, N, S: *gnas* for *man*.
- 17 F, L, M: insert /.
- 18 F, N: omit /.
- 19 D, J: omit /.
- 20 B, M, N, P: omit /.
- 21 D, N: omit /, [D end of folio].
- 22 B, J, L, N: omit /.
- 23 L, M: insert /.

VII.10 B 178b2, D 173a1, F 231a7, J 186b8, L 191a5, M 234a5, N 295a5, P 170b3, S 280b7:
 'od srung^a dge slong^b dag chos gos kyis^c cha^d ba^e la mngon par^f brtson gyi^g /¹ rnal
 'byor la mi brtson pa^h /² lus kyi rgyanⁱ lhur len pa³ /⁴ phyi rol⁵ gtsang sbra^j spyod la⁶ /
 nang 'dod chags dang /⁷ zhe sdang dang^k /⁸ gti mug gi dri mas^l yongs su⁹ gang ba dag
 ni^m gos bzang po ji¹⁰ tsam gyon¹¹ yang¹² 'od srungⁿ de dag lha mams dga' ba'i gzugs
 ma yin no^o // de ci'i phyir zhe na /^p lha mams kyis^q lus cha^r bar sbyor ba^s la brtson pa¹³
 de dag gi^t sems dang sems las byung^u ba mams shes te / shes nas kyang de dag rgyang
 bsring^s te¹⁴ yongs su¹⁵ spong^v bar 'gyur ro¹⁶ //

VII.11 B 178b5, D 173a3, F 231b1, J 187a2, L 191a7, M 234a8, N 295b1, P 170b5, S 281a3:
 'od srung^a dge tshul¹⁷ skul byed mi gtsang^b bas 'bags¹⁸ pa'i^c phyag dar khrod pa thogs
 nas¹⁹ bsod snyoms^d blangs te²⁰ mtsho ma dros par song ba dang^e / de der song ba'i^f
 tshe²¹ mtsho mchog de na^g gnas pa'i^h lha de dag gis rgyangⁱ ring por²² bsu ste^j /²³ rkang
 pa la mgok^k bos phyag 'tshal nas /²⁴ gtsang sbra spyod pa'i lha de dag gis²⁵ mi gtsang bas
 'bags²⁶ pa'i phyag dar khrod pa de bdag^l nyid kyis bkrus te²⁷ dri ma med par byas nas
 /²⁸ bkrus pa'i^m chuⁿ dri ma can des rang gi^o lus la skud^p de^q / skul byed kyi¹ tshul

- 1 F, L, N: omit /.
- 2 D, J, L, N: omit /.
- 3 D, J: omit *pa*.
- 4 J, N: omit /.
- 5 D, F, J: insert *gyi*.
- 6 D, J: *pa* for *la*. F: *spyod pa la* for *spyod la*.
- 7 F, N: omit /.
- 8 B, F, N, P: omit /.
- 9 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 10 F, M: *ci* for *ji*.
- 11 B, P: *gon* for *gyon*. F: inserts *na*.
- 12 B, L, N, P: *kyang* for *yang*. B, F, L, N, P, S: insert /.
- 13 F, M: *ba* for *pa*, and insert /.
- 14 L, M: insert /.
- 15 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 16 F, M: 'gyuro. N: omits *ro*, or 'gyuro with broken vowel sign?
- 17 B: *ba* for *tshul*. P: *dge tshul* cramped.
- 18 B, P: 'phags for 'bags. M: *spags* for 'bags. N, S: *sbags* for 'bags.
- 19 F, L, M, S: insert /.
- 20 B, M, P: insert /.
- 21 B, L, M, P: insert /.
- 22 D, J: *po nas* for *por*.
- 23 D, J, N: omit /.
- 24 D, J, L: omit /.
- 25 B, P: insert /.
- 26 B, P: 'phags for 'bags. M, N, S: *sbags* for 'bags.
- 27 F, M: insert /.
- 28 D, J, N: omit /.

bkrus pa'i^m chuⁿ dri ma can des rang gi^o lus la skud^p de^q / skul byed kyi¹ tshul khrims
kyi yon tan yang dag par blangs pa dang /^r snyoms par zhugs ba² shes nas³ mtsho de'i
lha mams yan lag lngas phyag 'tshal lo⁴ //

VII.12 B 179a1, D 173a5, F 231b5, J 187a5, L 191b2, M 234b3, N 295b4, P 170b8, S 281a6:
kun tu⁵ rgyu rab tu bzang po zhes bya^a ba de gos gtsang ma bgos nas⁶ bsod snyoms
blangs te⁷ mtsho ma dros par song ba dang / mtsho de na gnas pa'i lha de dag gis^b de
mtsho mchog 'dir kha zas zos nas lhag ma bor na⁸ mtsho mchog mi gtsang bar byas su^c
'ong zhes /⁹ rgyang grags gcig khor^d khor yug^e tsam gyi¹⁰ nang du 'dar¹¹ ma^f ster ba^g la
ltos /^h

VII.13 B 179a3, D 173a6, F 231b7, J 187a6, L 191b3, M 234b5, N 295b5, P 171a1, S 281b1:
'od srunga^a 'phags pa'i chos kyi yon tan sgrub¹² pa'i^b khyad par dang /¹³ skul byed kyi
phyag dar khrod pa^c bkrus pa'i chu^d dri ma can lha dag rang gi^e lus la skud pa dang /
kun tu¹⁴ rgyu rab tu^f bzang po ni 'gror yang ma ster ba la ltos /

VII.14 B 179a4, D 173a7, F 231b8, J 187a7, L 191b4, M 234b6, N 295b6, P 171a2, S 281b2:
'od srunga^a de lta bas na¹⁵ dge slong phyag dar khrod pa pa¹⁶ yon tan gyi chos 'di lta^b bu^c
'di dag 'dod pa^d /¹⁷ zhum zhum por^e ma gyur pa /¹⁸ 'phags pa'i rigs la gnas pas mchod
rien gyi 'du shes dang / ston pa'i 'du shes dang / bdag gi^f ba^g med cing yongs su¹⁹ 'dzin
pa med pa'i 'du shes kyis^h lus la phyag dar khrod pa dag bgo bar bya'o //

- 1 D, N: *gyi* for *kyi*.
- 2 B, F, P, S: *pa* for *ba*. L, N: *par* for *ba*.
- 3 B, L, M, P: insert /.
- 4 L, M, N: *'tshalo*.
- 5 D, J: *du* for *tu*.
- 6 L, M, S: insert /.
- 7 B, F, M, P: insert /.
- 8 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 9 D, J, N: omit /.
- 10 F: *gyis* for *gyi*. F: inserts *bar*. M, N, S: insert *bar du*.
- 11 B, P: *'dor* for *'dar*.
- 12 F, M, S: *bsgrub* for *sgrub*.
- 13 D, J: omit /.
- 14 D, J: *du* for *tu*.
- 15 L, M: insert /.
- 16 B, P: omit *pa* (P with one space). M, N: insert /.
- 17 N, S: omit /.
- 18 F, N: omit /.
- 19 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.

VII.15 B 179a6, D 173b1, F 232a1, J 187b1, L 191b6, M 234b8, N 296a1, P 171a4, S 281b4:
 'di ltar yang sems kyis lus dag par 'gyur gyi /¹ lus kyis sems dag par ni^a mi 'gyur ro² //
 de bas na sems dag par 'gyur bar byaⁱ³ /⁴ lus cha⁵ bas dag pa^b ni ma yin te^c / sems dag
 pa^d ni bcom ldan 'das kyi⁶ bstan pa la tshangs par spyod pa zhes gsungs so⁷ snyam du
 sems nges par bsam par^e bya'o //

VII.16 B 179a8, D 173b2, F 232a3, J 187b2, L 191b7, M 235a2, N 296a3, P 172a5, S 281b6:
 'od srung^a de ltar na dge slong phyag dar^b khrod pa pas⁸ khyod dang ngaⁱc rjes su⁹
 bslab par¹⁰ bya'o // ^d 'od srung^e 'di lta bu'i dus dang /¹¹ 'di lta bu'i man¹² yod de /^f 'od
 srung^g chos gos ngan pa gyon^h pa / chos gos ngan ngonⁱ gyis chog par^j 'dzin pa
 khyod¹³ gang du chos gos snam^k sbyar^l khri'u^m 'am¹⁴ khri'iⁿ steng du^o bzha¹⁵ ste /^p
 khyod bla gos gyon nas^q 'chag sar^r 'chag pa'i tshe¹⁶ lha brgya stong phrag mang po dag
 der^s lhags nas¹⁷ /¹⁸ 'di ni tshul khirms dang /¹⁹ ting nge²⁰ 'dzin dang /²¹ shes rab kyis
 yongs su²² bsgos^t pa'i lus la bgo^u bgo ba'i chos gos so²³ zhes²⁴ khyod kyi^v chos gos
 snam²⁵ sbyar de la phyag 'tshal bar 'gyur ro²⁶ // 'od srung^w ltos²⁷ chos gos la yang^x
 phyag 'tshal bar 'gyur na²⁸ lus la lta ci^y smos /^z

- 1 F, N: omit /.
- 2 F, M: 'gyuro.
- 3 B, P: bya'o for bya'i.
- 4 D, J, N: omit /. P, F: // for /.
- 5 B, N: che for cha.
- 6 F, L, N, S: kyis for kyi.
- 7 F, L, M, N: gsungso. B, P: insert //.
- 8 P: bas for pas. L, M: insert /.
- 9 F, L, M, N: rjesu.
- 10 F, M: bar for par.
- 11 L, N: omit /.
- 12 B: phan yon for man. P: phan for man.
- 13 B: inserts /. P: one space.
- 14 L, N: insert /.
- 15 F, S: gzha^g for bzha^g.
- 16 B, F, L, M, P: insert /.
- 17 B, P: na for nas.
- 18 D, J: omit /.
- 19 F, M, N: omit /.
- 20 F, L, N: tinge.
- 21 F, L, M, N: omit /.
- 22 F, L, M, N: yongsu.
- 23 L, M, N: goso. L, S: insert //.
- 24 B: inserts /. P: one space.
- 25 B, L: rnam for snam.
- 26 F, M, N: 'gyuro.
- 27 D, J, S: insert /.
- 28 B, L, M, P: insert /.

VII.17 B 179b4, D 173b4, F 232a6, J 187b5, L 192a2, M 235a4, N 296a6, P 171a8, S 282a2:
 'od srunga^a ji^b ltar na¹ dge slong nga^c rjes su² slob pa dag de bzhin du sgrub³ par 'gyur
 snyam ste /⁴ ngas 'khor los⁵ sgyur^d ba'i rgyal srid spangs^e nas⁶ rab tu byung ste^f /⁷ ka
 shi pa phra mo dang /^g du gu la^h ras dang /ⁱ ko'i tam^k pa^l ras dang / ngang ris can gyi
 chos gos mams spangs nas /⁸ 'phags pa'i rigs^m la dga' ba'i phyir⁹ sha na'i ras kyiⁿ gos
 rnams lus la bgos so¹⁰ //

VII.18 B 179b6, D 173b6, F 232a8, J 187b7, L 192a4, M 235a7, N 296b1, P 171b2, S 282a4:
 'od srunga^a ngas^b khyod las^c dar^d gos ngang¹¹ pa blangs te /¹² ngas^e khyod la sha na'i ras
 byin pa¹³ gang yin pa¹⁴ de thams cad^f kyang^g khyod nyid la snying brtse ba'i phyir yin¹⁵
 gyi /¹⁶ chags pa^h phyir ma yin /¹⁷ lusi brgyan pa'i phyir ma yin noi //

VII.19 B 179b7, D 173b6, F 232b1, J 187b8, L 192a5, M 235a8, N 296b2, P 171b3, S 282a6:
 'od srunga^a 'di la mi gti mug pa kha cig khyod dang^b nga^c rjes su¹⁸ mi slob^d cing /¹⁹
 brkame^e pa^f dang²⁰ chags pa'i zil gyis²¹ non^g pa / chos gos sogs²² par^h byed paⁱ / lhung
 bzed^j sogs²³ par byed pa / 'jig rten gyi zang zing sogs²⁴ par^k byed pa /²⁵ 'gron²⁶ bu dang
 / gser dang /^l nor² dang /^l 'bru sogs³ par byed pa / ba lang dang /^m lugⁿ dang / bya gag

- 1 B, P: omit *na*.
- 2 F, L, M, N: *rjesu*.
- 3 F, L, N: *bsgrub* for *sgrub*.
- 4 D, J: omit /.
- 5 B, N, P: *lo* for *los*.
- 6 F, M: insert /.
- 7 F, N: omit /.
- 8 D, J: omit /.
- 9 B, M, P: insert /.
- 10 F, M: *bgoso*. N: *bsgoso* for *bgos so*.
- 11 The reading *ngang* is a conjectural emendation for the *ngan* of all witnesses (B: *dan* for *ngan*).
- 12 F, N: omit /.
- 13 F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 14 F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 15 B, F, L, P: omit *yin*.
- 16 B, F, P: omit /.
- 17 M, N: omit /, [M end of line].
- 18 F, M: *rjesu*.
- 19 B [end of line]: // for /. D, F, J, N: omit /.
- 20 B: *pa'i* for *pa dang*. F, M, N, S: omit *dang*. P: *dang* cramped.
- 21 F, J: *kyis* for *gyis*.
- 22 B, F, P: *stsogs* for *sogs*. L: *bsogs* for *sogs*.
- 23 B, F, P: *stsogs* for *sogs*.
- 24 B, F, P: *stsogs* for *sogs*. L: *bsogs* for *sogs*.
- 25 B, P: omit /.
- 26 F, J, L, M, S: *mgon* for *'gron*.

gser dang /¹ nor² dang /¹ 'bru sogs³ par byed pa / 'ba lang dang /^m lugⁿ dang / bya gag
 dang / phag dang /⁴ bong bu⁰ dang / rta^p dang / thong gshol^q dang /⁵ shing rta 'dren pa^r
 dag^s nye bar 'jog par^t byed pa / khyim paⁱ las kyi mtha' spyod pa dag pas ni /⁶ 'od
 srung^u khyim pa dag la^v khyad par^w du 'gyur ba^x yod^y kyi^z / mi blun po rab tu byung^{aa}
 ba'i mtshams las 'das pa^{ab} de dag la ni^{ac} khyad par^{ad} du⁷ 'gyur ba⁸ gang yang med^{ae} do^{af}
 //ag

VII.20 A 390a1, B 180a3, D 174a2, F 232b4, J 188a3, L 192a8, M235b3, N 296b6, P171b6,
 S282b3:

'od srung^a khyim pa^b mams khyad par^c du^d 'gyur ba ni /⁹ dge sbyong ma yin la¹⁰ dge
 sbyong du khas 'che ba / tshangs par spyod pa ma yin^e la¹¹ tshangs par spyod par khas
 'che ba / gos ngur^f smrig bgos shing bya ba mang ba / sbag¹² pa^g sna tshogs kyis sbags
 pa^h /ⁱ zas dang gos lhur^j len pa¹³ de dag khyim pa dag gis¹⁴ gos ngur^k smrig^l gyon^m
 par¹⁵ rig nas¹⁶ zhe sa¹⁷ dang^u gus pa bskyed pa dang / chos gos dang /¹⁸ bsod snyoms
 kyis sdug¹⁹ par byed pa dang / gus⁰ par smra^p zhing phyag 'tshal la²⁰ ldang^q bar byed²¹
 ba²² ste / 'od srung^r 'di ni khyim^s pa de dag gi khyad par^t du 'gyur ba^u yin^v gyi /^w de dag
 rab tu byung ba de dag la ni med^x pa'o //y de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'di ltar de dag^z ni yongs

- 1 B, N [end of line]], P: omit /.
- 2 D, J, P: insert *bu*. (P: *bu* and following *dang* cramped.)
- 3 B, F, P: *stsogs* for *sogs*. L: *tshogs* for *sogs*.
- 4 L: omits *phag dang* /. B, P: omit /.
- 5 B, P: omit /.
- 6 D, J: omit /.
- 7 M, N, S: omit *du*.
- 8 B, F: *pa* for *ba*.
- 9 D, F, J, N: omit /.
- 10 B, F, P, S: insert /.
- 11 F, M, S: insert /.
- 12 N, P: *sbags* for *sbag*.
- 13 F, M: insert /.
- 14 D: *ma* of *khyim* and *pa dag gis* cramped. J: *gXs*, with vowel obscured, but given the readings of other versions probably *gos*, so *gis* omitted? L: *gis* omitted.
- 15 F, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 16 B, F, L, P, S: insert /.
- 17 D, J: *rjes* for *zhe sa*. B, L, M, P: *zhes* for *zhe sa*.
- 18 F, N, S: omit /.
- 19 B, L, P, N: *sdud* for *sdug*.
- 20 B, M, N, P: insert /.
- 21 A: resumes here with *byed* on folio 90a.
- 22 B, F: *pa* for *ba*.

su¹ len^{2a} pa la brtson pa ma yin^{ab} zhing /² ci yang^{ac} mi^{ad} sogs³ pa'i phyir ro^{ae} //

VII.21 A 390a1, B 180a8, D 174a4, F 232b7, J 188a6, L 192b3, M 235b6, N 297a2, P 172a1, S 282b7:

'od srunga^a de'i tshe de'i^b dus na^c dge slong phal^d cher lhung bzed^e dang⁴ chos gos mang zhing^f snod spyad mang ba dang⁵ rnyed pa^g mang bar 'gyur te / de dag la bsti⁶ stang^h byed par 'gyur / btsun par⁷ byed par 'gyur / ri mo byed cingⁱ mchod pa⁸ byed par 'gyur ro⁹ // de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'di ltar de sbyin pa¹⁰ dang / phyir sbyin pa¹¹ dus dus su¹² byed cing¹³ bya ba ji^k lta ba^l bzhin du yongs su¹⁴ 'dzin^m pa'i phyir roⁿ //

VII.22 A 390a3, B 180b2, D 174a6, F 233a1, J 188a7, L 192b5, M 235b8, N 297a4, P 172a3, S 283a2:

dge slong gang dag tshul khirms dang ldan pa¹⁵ /¹⁶ dge ba'i^a chos can¹⁷ zag pa rnams zad par byed pa^b la mngon par^c brtson pa¹⁸ /¹⁹ yid byung²⁰ pa²¹ /²² mgo dang^d gos la me^e 'bar ba bzhin du brtson pa²³ /²⁴ don nyung ba²⁵ byed ba²⁶ nyung ba^f /²⁷ rang gi don

- 1 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 2 A, D, J, L: omit /.
- 3 A, B, F, P: *stsogs* for *sogs*. L: *bsogs* for *sogs*.
- 4 A, B, F, P: insert /.
- 5 A, F, L, M, S: insert /.
- 6 A, B, J, L, P: *sti* for *bsti*. F: *sting* for *bsti*.
- 7 A, F, J, L, M: *bar* for *par*.
- 8 B, P: *par* for *pa*.
- 9 F, M: *'gyuro*.
- 10 A, F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 11 B: *pa'i* for *pa*. F, M: *ba* for *pa*. P: one space after *pa*.
- 12 F, L: *dusu*. J: *sa* for *su*? *pa dus dus sa* cramped.
- 13 B, M, P: insert /.
- 14 F, L, N: *yongsu*.
- 15 F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 16 A, N: omit /.
- 17 D, J, M: insert /.
- 18 F, M: *ba* for *pa*. D, J, P: insert *dang*. L: inserts *yin*.
- 19 B, N, P: omit /.
- 20 P: *pa dang yid byung* cramped. F, N: *'byung* for *byung*.
- 21 B, F, M, P, S: *ba* for *pa*.
- 22 A, N: omit / . L: omits *yid byung pa* /.
- 23 F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 24 A, N: omit /.
- 25 A, F, P, S: insert /.
- 26 B, F, L: *pa* for *ba*.
- 27 A, F: omit /.

la brtson pa^g /¹ 'dris par^h byed paⁱ yongs su² spangs^j pa dag 'byung ba³ de dag gik^k gan
 du ni /⁴ de'i tshe de'i dus na^l su yang^m miⁿ 'gro^{5o} mi sten^p cing^q bsnyen bkur mi^r byed
 par 'gyur ro⁶ //^s de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'di lta^r khyim^t pa dag^u ni chags paⁱ rang bzhin can⁷
 tshe 'di⁸ lhur len gyi⁹ / tshe rabs phyi ma lhur len^v pa^w ma yin bas¹⁰ /¹¹ de dag 'di snyam
 du^x dge slong de dag la ni¹² bdag cag gi^y 'tsho^z ba med^{aa} na^{ab} /¹³ bdag cag^{ac} gis ci'i^{ad}
 phyir^{ae} bsten¹⁴ / ci'i phyir phyag bya /¹⁵ ci'i phyir mchod / ci'i phyir bsnyen bkur bya
 snyam du sems pa^{af} phyir ro¹⁶ //¹⁷ gzhan du na gang dag dge baⁱ rtsa ba bskyed pa /¹⁸
 sngon gyi sbyor^{ag} ba^{ah} phun sum tshogs pa dag 'byung zhing¹⁹ tshul khirms dang ldan
 pa²⁰ /²¹ dge baⁱ chos can^{ai} de lta bu de dag la sten²² par byed²³ /²⁴ snyen²⁵ par byed
 cing²⁶ bsnyen bkur byed pa ni ma gtogs te^{aj} nyung ngo^{ak} //²⁷

VII.23 A 390a6, B 180b7, D 174b2, F 233a6, J 188b4, L 193a1, M 236a5, N 297b2, P 172a8, S
 283a7:

'od srung^a chos 'di lta bu²⁸ tshul dang^b 'thun²⁹ pa³⁰ 'di lta bu 'di dag ni gang zag gnyis

- 1 A, N, P: omit /. P: adds one space.
- 2 F, L, N: *yongsu*.
- 3 F, M: insert /.
- 4 A, D, J, N: omit /.
- 5 D, J, L, S: insert /.
- 6 F, M: *'gyuro*.
- 7 B, L, P: insert /. F: inserts *de*.
- 8 B, P: *'di'i* for *'di*. L: inserts *lta*.
- 9 A: *lend kyi* for *len gyi*. B, P: *gyis* for *gyi*.
- 10 B, L, P, S: *pas* for *bas*.
- 11 A, B, D, J, N: omit /.
- 12 B, P: insert /.
- 13 A, D, F, J: omit /.
- 14 A: *bstend* for *bsten*. D, J: *ston* for *bsten*.
- 15 B, P: omit /.
- 16 F, L, M: *phyiro*.
- 17 A, J [end of line]: / for //.
- 18 A, N: omit /.
- 19 F, M, S: insert /.
- 20 F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 21 A, F, M, N, S: omit /.
- 22 A: *bstend* for *sten*. L, N: *bsten* for *sten*.
- 23 F, L: insert *pa*.
- 24 B, P: omit /.
- 25 A: *bsnyend* for *snyen*. F: *sten* for *snyen*. L, N: *bsnyen* for *snyen*.
- 26 B, L, P, S: insert /.
- 27 B, M: / for //.
- 28 B, P: *bu'i* for *bu*. D, J: insert /.
- 29 L, N, S: *mithun* for *'thun*. F: *ldan* for *'thun*.
- 30 A, M: *ba* for *pa*. M: inserts /. F: *ba'i* for *pa*.

kyi^c yid du 'ong bar 'gyur te / gnyis gang zhe na / bden pa¹ mthong zhing^d 'khor ba la
 'jigs par lta ba dang / rnal 'byor^e spyod^f pa la brtson zhing² 'bras bu thob par 'dod pa /³
 las kyi mam par^g smin^h pa la rtonⁱ pa /^j chos don duk gnyer zhing^l chos 'dod pa'o //

VII.24 A 390a7, B 181a1, D 174b3, F 233a7, J 188b5, L 193a3, M 236a7, N 297b4, P 172b1, S 283b2:

'od srunga mngon par⁴ mi^b brtson pa⁵ chos ma yin ba⁶ la lta ba / las kyi mam par^c smin^d
 pa dang^e 'gal ba / 'jig rten pha rol^f tu⁷ kha na ma tho bas 'jigs par mi^g lta ba⁸ /⁹ tshe 'di
 lhur len^h pa /ⁱ tshe rabs phyi ma lhur mi^j len^k pa¹⁰ thams cad^l kyi sgo^m ngas bshad parⁿ
 bya'o //^o

VII.25 A 390a8, B 181a3, D 174b4, F 233a8, J 188b6, L 193a4, M 236a8, N 297b5, P 172b2, S 283b4:

'od srunga gang dag tha na^b thar^c pa dang ldan paⁱ¹¹ sems gcig^d tsam yang mi^e skyed¹²
 paⁱ mi^f gti mug pa de dag la ni^g ngas 'di lta buⁱ chos 'dir¹³ skabs mi^h 'byed kyiⁱ steng du^j
 'di lta buⁱ chos 'di dag thos na /¹⁴ bdag sgrub¹⁵ pa las nyams par rig nas¹⁶ smad par¹⁷
 bya bar sems te /^k 'di dag ni^l sangs rgyas kyis gsungs pa ma yin gyi /^m 'di dag ni rang
 bzor sbyarⁿ ba^o 'am /^p bdud kyis tho¹⁸ btsams¹⁹ nas²⁰ byas pa'o zhes smra zhing²¹ de
 dag 'di lta^q skye bo mang po dag²² log par 'dzin du^r 'jug par 'gyur ro²³ // de dag ni bdags

- 1 A, F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 2 B, P: insert /.
- 3 A, L, N: omit /.
- 4 A, F, M: : *bar* for *par*.
- 5 A, M: *ba* for *pa*. B, D, J, P: insert /.
- 6 B, L, P, S: *pa* for *ba*.
- 7 F, N: *du* for *tu*.
- 8 D, J: *bas* for *ba*.
- 9 A, D, J: omit /.
- 10 F, M: insert /.
- 11 A, M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 12 L, N: *bskyed* for *skyed*.
- 13 D, J, P: '*di* for '*dir*. (P: one space after '*di*.)
- 14 A, D, J, N: omit /.
- 15 D, L, N: *bsgrub* for *sgrub*.
- 16 B, F, P: insert /.
- 17 B, F, M: *pa* for *par*. P: *par* cramped.
- 18 J, N, S: *mtho* for *tho*. D: one space before *tho* with three *tshegs*.
- 19 J, L, N: *brtsams* for *btsams*.
- 20 F, M: insert /.
- 21 F, L, M, S: insert /.
- 22 A, F: insert *la*.
- 23 F, L, M, N: '*gyuro*.

kyang phung la /¹ gzhan dag² kyang^t phung bar byed par 'gyur /^u bdag kyang nyon
mongs pa can du gyur³ la⁴ gzhan^v yang⁵ nyon mongs pa can du byed par⁶ 'gyur te / de
ltar mi^w gti mug pa de dag ni^x bdag la phan pa⁷ dang /^y gzhan la phan paⁱ⁸ phyir zhugs
pa ma yin no⁹ //

VII.26 A 390a11, B 181a8, D 174b7, F 233b4, J 189a2, L 193a7, M 236b4, N 298a2, P 172b6, S
284a1:

de nas bcom ldan 'das la tshe dang ldan ba¹⁰ 'od srunga^a chen pos^b 'di skad ces gsol^c to //
bcom ldan 'das¹¹ bcom ldan 'das¹² de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa¹³ yang dag par
rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas kyis¹⁴ dkon mchog brtsegs pa'i^d chos kyi nram grangs¹⁵ 'dir nan
tan snying por bgyid pa'i gang zag chos kyi^e dbang phyug nams la /¹⁶ sangs rgyas
bcom ldan 'das nams kyi¹⁷ thugs rje chen po gang lags pa de rgya cher yang dag par rab
tu bshad lags so¹⁸ // bcom ldan 'das sems can^f gang dag chos kyi nram grangs 'di thos
nas mos shing¹⁹ de bzhin nyid du^g sgrub^h pa de dag ni sangs as kyisⁱ yongs su²⁰
bzung ba lags so²¹ //

VII.27 A 390b2, B 181b3, D 175a2, F 233b7, J 189a5, L 193b2, M 236b7, N 298a5, P 173a1, S
284a4:

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal^a pa /^b 'od srung^c de de^d bzhin no^e // de de bzhin te / gang

- 1 A, D, F, J, N: omit /.
- 2 F, N: omit *dag*.
- 3 F, L: 'gyur for gyur.
- 4 F, L, M, S: insert /.
- 5 D, M, S: *dag kyang* for *yang*. (D: *dag kyang* very cramped.)
- 6 F, S: omit *byed par*.
- 7 F, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 8 A, F, M: : *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
- 9 F, M, N: *yino*.
- 10 F, L, S: *pa* for *ba*. B: omits *la tshe dang ldan pa*.
- 11 B, P: insert /.
- 12 A, F: omit *bcom ldan 'das*.
- 13 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 14 B, L, P: insert /.
- 15 B: omits *chos kyi*. P: *chos kyi nram grangs* very cramped.
- 16 A, D, J, N: omit /.
- 17 M, S: omit *kyi*.
- 18 F, L, M, N: *lagso*.
- 19 B, F, P, S: insert /.
- 20 F, L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 21 F, L, M, N: *lagso*.

dag chos kyi mam^f grangs 'di thos nas¹ mos shing² de bzhin nyid du^g sgrub pa'i sems
can^h de dag ni sangs rgyas kyi yongs su³ bzungⁱ ba yin no⁴ //

VII.28 A 390b3, B 181b5, D 175a3, F 233b8, J 189a6, L 193b3, M 236b8, N 298a6, P 173a2, S
284a6:

de nas bcom ldan 'das kyi⁵ tshe dang ldan pa⁶ kun dga' bo^a la bka' stsal^b pa /^c kun dga'
bo^d khyod kyi rigs kyi bu dang /⁷ rigs kyi bu mo dge ba'i rtsa ba bskyed pa /⁸ zhi ba
'dod pa /⁹ grol bar 'dod pa¹⁰ de dag gi ched du chos kyi le'u 'di zung shig /^e khyim^f pa
dang¹¹ rab tu byung ba de dag kyang chos 'di la bslabs nas /¹² phung po thams cad rab
tu spangs pa'i^g mya ngan las 'das pa thob par¹³ 'gyur ro¹⁴ //

VII.29 A 390b4, B 181b7, D 175a4, F 234a2, J 189a8, L 193b5, M 237a2, N 298b1, P 173a4, S
284b1:

gsol^a pa /¹⁵ bcom ldan 'das¹⁶ bdag gis chos kyi nram grangs 'di^b bzung^c lags na^d / bcom
ldan 'das chos kyi^e mam grangs 'di^f ming^g ci^h lags / 'di jiⁱ ltar gzung¹⁷ bar bgyi /¹⁸

VII.30 A 390b5, B 181b8, D 175a5, F 234a3, J 189b1, L 193b6, M 237a3, N 298b2, P 173a4, S
284b2:

bcom ldan 'das kyi^a bka' stsal^a pa /^b kun dga' bo^c de'i phyir chos kyi^d nram grangs 'di^e
chos thams cad yang dag par bsdus^f pa zhes bya bar¹⁹ zung shig^g / 'phags pa'i rigs
sbyang^h pa'i yon tan gyi gnas dang / tshul khrims dang ldan pa²⁰ yongs su²¹ 'dzin pa

- 1 B, F, P: insert /.
- 2 D, J, S: insert /.
- 3 L, M, N: *yongsu*.
- 4 M, N: *yino*.
- 5 B, P: insert /.
- 6 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 7 A, N: omit /.
- 8 A, N: omit /.
- 9 A, D, J, N: omit /.
- 10 B, P: insert /.
- 11 A, F: insert /.
- 12 A, D, J, N: omit /.
- 13 D, J, N, S: *bar* for *par*.
- 14 L, M, N: *'gyuro*.
- 15 A, B, J, P: omit /.
- 16 B, P: insert /.
- 17 A, L, N: *bzung* for *gzung*.
- 18 B, P: // for /.
- 19 A, N: insert *yang*.
- 20 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 21 L, M, N: *yongsu*.

dang / tshul khrimsi 'chal pa spa^k 'gongl ba^m dang / rin po che brtsegs pa dang / rin po
che'iⁿ phung po dang / rin po che^o bsags¹ pa dang / rin po che'i chos kyi^p sgo'i^q le'u zhes
bya bar yang zung shig^r /

VII.31 A 390b6, B 182a3, D 175a7, F 234a5, J 189b3, L 193b8, M 237a5, N 298b4, P 173a6, S
284b4:

bcom ldan 'das kyis^a de skad ces bka' stsal^b nas^c / tshe dang ldan ba² 'od srung^d chen po
dang / tshe dang ldan pa³ kun dga' bo^e dang / lha dang /⁴ mi^f dang /⁵ lha ma yin dang^g /
dri zar bcas pa'i^h 'jig rten yi⁶ rangs te /ⁱ bcom ldan 'das kyis gsungs pa la mngon par^j
bstod^k do //

VII.32 A 390b8, B 182a5, D 175b1, F 234a7, J 189b4, L 194a1, M 237a6, N 298b6, P 173a8, S
284b6:

⁷ 'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i⁸ chos kyi mnam^a grangs le'u⁹ stong phrag
brgya pa^b las¹⁰ rin po che'i phung po'i le'u^c zhes bya^d ste /¹¹ bzhi bcu rtsa^e bzhi¹² pa^f
rdzogs so¹³ //¹⁴

¹⁵ //g rgya gar gyi mkhan po su ren dra^h bo dhi¹⁶ dang /¹⁷ zhu chenⁱ gyi lo tstshaj ba¹⁸
ban de^k ye shes sdes bsgyur cing zhus te^l gtan^m la phab pa¹⁹ //²⁰

- 1 B, F: *brtsegs* for *bsags*. P: *bstsags* for *bsags*.
- 2 B, L, P: *pa* for *ba*.
- 3 A, M: *ba* for *pa*.
- 4 B, F, L, N, P: omit /.
- 5 B, F, L, P: omit /.
- 6 A, B, F, L, P: *yid* for *yi*.
- 7 B, D: insert //.
- 8 A, F, M: : *po* for *po'i*.
- 9 F, M, N, S: omit *le'u*.
- 10 A, B, F, L, P, S: insert /. L: inserts '*phags pa*.
- 11 D, J, L: omit /. F, M, N, S: insert '*dus pa* after /.
- 12 A, B: *gsum* for *bzhi*.
- 13 A, B, F, P: *s.ho* for *so*. L: *rdzogs.ho*. M, N: *rdzogso*.
- 14 A, F: end here. J: // invisible at end of line. N: inserts // *bam pa gnyiso / sho loga drug brgya*
bdun cu //, and ends here.
- 15 M, S: insert here: // *bam po gnyis so* [M *gnyiso*] // *shlau* [M *sho lo*] *ka drug brgya bdun cu*.
- 16 B: *dhe* for *dhi*. P, L: *de* for *dhi*.
- 17 B, P: // for /.
- 18 B, P: insert /.
- 19 B, P: insert *lags so*.
- 20 P, S: add //.

Single Readings to the Tibetan Edition

L0

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) J, L: omit: XX | b) L: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| c) L: written <i>po'i</i> for space | d) L: inserts //. |
| e) F: <i>ha</i> for <i>hā</i> . | f) N: The phrase <i>bod skad du</i> illegible. |
| g) F: inserts <i>dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po chos kyi rnams grangs le'u stong phrag brgya pa las</i> /. | |
| h) C: <i>che'</i> . | i) S: <i>do</i> for <i>mdo</i> . |
| j) F: gap of five spaces. | k) M: <i>thamd</i> . |
| l) J: /for //. | |

L1

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| a) B: <i>po</i> for <i>po'i</i> . | b) F: omits <i>kyi</i> . |
| c) N: omits /. | d) F: omits <i>tsam</i> . |
| e) F: <i>gi</i> for <i>gyi</i> . | f) S: <i>gis</i> . |
| g) F: <i>sangyas</i> for <i>sangs rgyas</i> . | |
| h) L: <i>sa</i> of <i>tshogs</i> and <i>nas 'dus</i> written small in space for two letters. | |
| i) L: <i>cig</i> for <i>gcig</i> . | j) P: //. |
| k) J: //for /. N: omits /. | l) L: inserts /. |
| m) F: inserts /. | n) L: <i>stago</i> . |
| o) J: //for /. N: <i>ga</i> //for <i>go</i> /. | |

L2

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| a) C: three <i>tshegs</i> here. | b) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| c) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | d) L: inserts /. |
| e) M: inserts /. | f) J: //for /. |
| g) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | |
| h) L: omits <i>chen po</i> . N: space of one letter after <i>chen po</i> . | |
| i) N: <i>na</i> for <i>ni</i> . | j) M: omits /. |
| k) M: omits /. | l) F: <i>pa</i> added below line. |
| m) F: inserts <i>ba</i> , but cancels it. | n) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa dang</i> . |
| o) F: <i>rnams</i> written, with <i>sa</i> cancelled. | p) M: <i>namr</i> . |
| q) M: <i>namr</i> . | r) N: space of one letter. |
| s) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | t) N: <i>bzhag</i> for <i>gzag</i> . |
| u) J: //for /. | v) M: omits <i>bsgom pa</i> . |
| w) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | x) N: <i>dang</i> for <i>dad</i> . |
| y) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | z) P: <i>dang</i> . |
| aa) P: <i>dang</i> . | ab) J: //for /. |
| ac) P: <i>dang</i> . | ad) C <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| ae) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | af) N: <i>rab</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| ag) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | |
| ah) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . N: three letter space after <i>pa</i> . | ai) J: //for /. |
| aj) P: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | ak) F: one space. |
| al) J: //for /. | am) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| an) J: //for /. | ao) M: <i>thamd</i> . |
| ap) P: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | aq) J: //for /. |
| ar) M: <i>rten</i> . | as) J: //for /. |

- at) N: *pa'i* for *par*.
 au) F: inserts here: *yang dag pa'i lta ba dang /*.
 av) P: small space, evidently some correction. aw) P: has one space after *mtshong*
 ax) F: *gzhi* for *bzhi*.
 ay) P: very cramped at beginning of folio from here through *don la rton gyi*.
 az) M: *ba* for *pa*. ba) L: *ston* for *rton*.
 bb) P: *tsheg*? bc) L: *sron* for *rton*; S: *rtog* for *rton*.
 bd) L: *ston* for *rton*. be) P: *kyi* for *gyi*.
 bf) S: one space at beginning of line. bg) L: *ston* for *rton*.
 bh) P: *kyi* for *gyi*. bi) L: *ston* for *rton*.
 bj) L: *ston* for *rton*.
 bk) B: omits *ldan pa dang /* of 34, and all of 36, 36 37.
 bl) L: *ston* for *rton*. bm) L: *ston* for *rton*.
 bn) M: *ba* for *pa*. bo) N: omits /.
 bp) N: *du* for *tu*. bq) N: *bsrung* for *srung*.
 br) N: space of two letters. bs) N inserts *ba*.
 bt) M: *pa* for *ba*. bu) N: space of two letters.
 bv) M: *byas pa* for *bya ba*. bw) F: *pa* added below line.
 bx) M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*. by) M: *gyis* for *gyi*. N: space of two letters.
 bz) B: omits item 47. ca) M: *ba* for *pa*. N: space of two letters.
 cb) N: space of five letters. cc) N: space of two letters.
 cd) C *ba* for *pa*. ce) F: *ba* for *pa*.
 cf) C *ba* for *pa*. cg) S: one space; erased letter.
 ch) M: *ba* for *pa*. N: space of two letters. ci) M: *bar* for *par*.
 cj) F: *rig* for *rigs*. N: space of two letters. ck) P: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
 cl) P: one space. cm) C: *ba* for *pa*.
 cn) N: space of two letters. co) M: inserts /.
 cp) M: *tu* for *pu*. N: *pur* for *pu*. P: *bu* for *pu*. cq) N: space of two letters.
 cr) N: space of one letter. cs) M: *namr*.
 ct) N: space of two letters. cu) P: end of line omits /.
 cv) N: space of two letters. cw) C, M: *ba* for *pa*.
 cx) N: space of two letters. cy) S: *ba* for *pa*.
 cz) M: *thamd*. da) N: space of two letters.
 db) N: space of two letters. dc) M: *sman* for *smad*.
 dd) L: *la* for *las*. N: one space after *las*. de) N: space of two letters.
 df) B: *ma* for *sa*. dg) N: space of three letters.
 dh) N: space of two letters. di) N: space of two letters.
 dj) N: *bsrung* for *srung*.
 dk) P: // at end of folio. C omits /, with one space. dl) F: *myed* for *med*.
 dm) N: space of two letters. dn) F: *myed* for *med*.
 do) C: / broken? dp) N: space of two letters.
 dq) C: *gyis* for *kyis*. dr) J: omits /?
 ds) P: one space. dt) M: *thamd*.
 du) N: space of two letters. dv) S: one space.
 dw) N: space of three letters. dx) F: *'thil* for *mithil*.
 dy) N: space of three letters. dz) N: space of three letters.
 ea) S: *srungs* for *srung*. eb) C: *ge* for *gi* (broken?).
 ec) N: space of three letters. ed) F: omits *de*.
 ee) N: space of three letters. ef) P: // cramped.

L3

- a) M: *bcomds*.
 c) N: space of two letters.
 e) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 g) M: *bcomds*.
 i) M: *ba* for *pa*. N: space of three letters.
 k) N: space of three letters .
 m) N: space of three letters .
 o) N: space of three letters .
 q) J: *lag* for *lags*.
 s) B: *mching* for *mchid*.
 u) N: space of five letters.
 v) F: omits *pa ma lags par tshangs par spyod*.
 x) N: space of three letters .
 z) N: space of three letters .
 ab) M: omits *kyang*.
 ad) M: *sem'd* . N: space of three letters.
 af) N: inserts /.
 ah) N: space of three letters .
 aj) M: inserts /.
 al) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 an) F: *sbyong* for *slong*.
 ap) C: the *la* looks to be upside-down and backwards!
 aq) N: space of four letters.
 as) F: omits /.
 au) N: inserts *dang*.
 aw) N: space of two letters.
 ay) F: omits /.
 ba) N: space of four letters.
- b) P: inserts /.
 d) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 f) N: space of three letters .
 h) N: space of three letters .
 j) F: *par* for *pa'i*. N: space of three letters.
 l) N: space of three letters .
 n) N: space of five letters.
 p) F: omits *yang dag par*.
 r) F: inserts / . N: space of five letters.
 t) B: '*chi* for '*che*. F: *mche* for '*che*.
 w) B: *mching* for *mchid*.
 y) F: *lagsam*, end of line.
 aa) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 ac) F: '*das* added below line.
 ae) F: *sangyas*.
 ag) C: *ba* for *pa*.
 ai) S: '*jigs* for '*jig*.
 ak) N: space of four letters.
 am) N: space of three letters.
 ao) C: *ba* for *pa*.
 ar) C: *ba* for *pa*.
 at) F: inserts *dang*.
 av) N: space of three letters .
 ax) N: space of three letters .
 az) F: writes *dang* below line.
 bb) C: *kya* for *gya*.

L4

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 c) C: *bo* for *po*.
 e) F: four spaces after *ni*.
 g) J: *bcu* for *cu*.
 i) F: inserts *rnams*.
 k) F: *stod* for *bstod*.
 m) C: *ba* for *pa*.
 o) C: *bas* for *pas*.
 q) L: *chung* for *chud*.
 r) N: not clear; perhaps *son*, but definitely not *gzon*.
 s) M: *pa* for *ba*.
 u) F: '*byung* for *byung*.
 w) S: one space.
 y) M: *bar* for *par*.
 aa) N: *pa dang* / for *pas*.
 ac) L: omits *la*.
 ae) L: inserts /.
- b) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 d) P: two or three spaces.
 f) B: space of one erased letter.
 h) M: *rnām*.
 j) M: *rnām*.
 l) F: *smod* for *brnyas*.
 n) M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*. F: *pa* for *pa'i*.
 p) C: *byin* looks like *ben*.
 t) F: *kyims* for *khyim*.
 v) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 x) P: one space at beginning of line.
 z) F: *rtogs* for *rtog*.
 ab) D: *bar* for *par*.
 ad) F: *phra* for *phrag*.
 af) L: *yongsu*.

- | | |
|--|--|
| ag) F: <i>tshos pa</i> for <i>tshol ba</i> . | ah) P: <i>dag</i> for <i>dge</i> . |
| ai) L: inserts /. | aj) F: <i>sa</i> added below line. |
| ak) F: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . | al) P: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| am) L: inserts /. | an) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| ao) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . | |
| ap) B: <i>ba</i> repeated and the end of one line and beginning of next. | |
| aq) M: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . | ar) M: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . N: omits <i>mngon par</i> . |
| as) F: <i>yi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | at) P: / for //. |
| au) F: <i>bkris</i> for <i>dkris</i> . | av) M: <i>rnair</i> . |
| aw) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . | ax) B: // for / [P: end of line only /]. |
| ay) M: <i>rnair</i> . | az) M: <i>gsun</i> . |
| ba) L: <i>skag</i> for <i>skrag</i> . | bb) L: <i>spang</i> for <i>spong</i> . |
| bc) F: <i>dang</i> for <i>ste</i> . | bd) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| be) F: <i>bcu</i> for <i>cu</i> . | bf) L: <i>dang</i> for <i>ste</i> . |
| bg) L: <i>nas</i> for <i>na</i> . | |

L5

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) M: <i>brgya</i> for <i>brgyad</i> . |
| c) F: // for /. | d) F: omits /. |
| e) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . S: <i>pa'i</i> . | f) J: omits <i>sde</i> . |
| g) M: <i>semin</i> . | h) N: inserts <i>dang</i> . |
| i) F: inserts <i>rnams</i> . | j) F: omits <i>dang</i> . |
| k) P: looks like <i>thstan</i> . (<i>tha</i> for <i>ba</i> ? dirt on the photo?) | |
| l) N: <i>nas</i> for <i>na</i> . | m) N: omits <i>zhes</i> . |
| n) N: <i>lung</i> for <i>ltung</i> . | |
| o) B: omits <i>bzhin du ltung ba</i> (haplography). | p) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| q) M: inserts //. | r) S: / added below line. |
| s) J: / for //. | |

L6

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) F: inserts <i>gi</i> . |
| c) N: <i>gi</i> for <i>ni</i> . | d) M: inserts /. |
| e) B: omits <i>gyi chos la nan tan</i> . | f) N: omits <i>ngo</i> . |
| g) P: <i>zhas</i> for <i>zhes</i> . | h) F: omits <i>ngas</i> . |
| i) J: / for //. | j) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| k) J: / for //. | l) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| m) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | n) N: omits <i>gang</i> . |
| o) N: inserts /. | p) N: <i>pa'i</i> for <i>pas</i> . P: <i>bas</i> for <i>pas</i> . |
| q) F: <i>bcang</i> for <i>'chang</i> . | |
| r) M: <i>bsam bas</i> for <i>bsampas</i> . L: some letter erased here at the beginning of a line. N: <i>bas</i> for <i>pas</i> . | |
| s) J: / for //. | t) M: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . |
| u) N: <i>kyis</i> for <i>kyi</i> . | v) F: <i>pa'i</i> . L: <i>par</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| w) F: <i>byis</i> for <i>byams</i> . | x) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| y) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | z) F: <i>de</i> for <i>te</i> . |
| aa) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | ab) M: <i>rnair</i> . |
| ac) M: <i>rnair</i> . | ad) F: <i>thong</i> for <i>mithong</i> . |
| ae) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | af) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |

- ag) M: omits *'phags pa*.
 ai) F: *kyis* for *kyi*.
 ak) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 am) N: *'di* for *de*.

- ah) F: *'phags pa* added below line.
 aj) F: *ste* for *te*.
 al) D: *bo* for *po*.
 an) M: *mtshano*.

L7

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 c) N: omits *mi*.
 e) F: inserts *ki*.
 g) M: inserts /.
 i) J: /for //.
 k) F: *stan* for *bstan*.
 m) F: omits *las*.
 o) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 q) F: *bshado*.
 s) J: /for //.
 u) L: *nyams* for *nyam*.
 w) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 y) N: *gi* for *gis*.
 aa) B: *bcangs* for *bcang ba*.

- b) F: inserts /.
 d) M: *bar* for *par*.
 f) F: *'di dag* for *de*.
 h) M: *bshado*.
 j) J: /for //.
 l) J: /for //.
 n) J: /for //.
 p) J: /for //.
 r) J: /for //.
 t) J: /for //.
 v) J: /for //.
 x) S: one letter erased here.
 z) S: one space.
 ab) J: /for //.

L8

- a) N: *de la* for *des*.
 c) S: one space.
 e) S: one space.
 f) L: after the /, space of eleven characters, then //.
 h) F: *sangyas*.
 j) P: one space.
 l) M: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
 n) M: *sdom* at end of line.
 o) L: *bya'o snyam pa ste* for *mi sdom pa dang*.
 q) M: *skyedo*.
 b) F: omits *la*.
 d) L: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
 g) S: one space.
 i) L: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
 k) L: inserts //.
 m) F: omits *yang dag par*.
 p) Śikṣ P: omits *dag*.
 r) J: /for //.

L9

- a) F: *slong* for *sbyong*.
 c) D: *zhi* for *nyi* (?).
 e) Śikṣ D: //for /.
 g) F: omits *dag*.
 i) M: omits.
 k) F: *ca* for *cha*.
 m) F: *long* for *longs*.
 o) M: *thamd*.
 q) F: inserts *cha*, but there may be cancellation marks above it. N: *ba* for *la*. S: inserts /.
 r) N: omits *gi*.
 t) S: inserts /.
 v) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 b) Śikṣ P: omits *gnod pa byed pa*.
 d) M: *semn*.
 f) M: *semn*.
 h) P: *mko* for *mgo* (broken?).
 j) M: omits.
 l) F: *deg* for *de dag*.
 n) S: *spyod* for *spyad*.
 p) Śikṣ P: *ta* for *te*.
 s) L: inserts /.
 u) S: inserts /.
 w) N: omits *yang*. S: *ba'ang* for *ba yang*.

L10

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) N: inserts <i>pa</i> . |
| c) F: writes <i>ma</i> below line. | d) F: <i>pa</i> for <i>par</i> . |
| e) P: four or five spaces. | f) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| g) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | h) F: inserts /. |
| i) B: <i>nges pa rnyes</i> for <i>des brnyas</i> . | j) J: <i>te</i> for <i>ste</i> . |
| k) P: at beginning of line four spaces. | l) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| m) B: <i>dga'</i> for <i>dka'</i> . | |
| n) B: <i>ba gang</i> for <i>bdag</i> (P: not clear). N: <i>brgyal</i> for <i>bgad</i> . | |
| o) B: <i>pud</i> for <i>bud</i> . | p) N: <i>medu</i> . |
| q) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . | r) N: omits <i>bar</i> . |
| s) S: <i>su'ang</i> . | t) B: <i>par</i> for <i>bar</i> . |
| u) L: omits <i>la</i> . | v) B: <i>par</i> for <i>bar</i> . |
| w) N: ' <i>di</i> for <i>de</i> . | x) F: <i>thob</i> for ' <i>thob</i> . |
| y) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | z) L: inserts /. |
| aa) M: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . | ab) F: omits <i>dag</i> . |
| ac) D: / for //. | |

L11

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) N: omits <i>gang</i> . |
| c) S: inserts /. | d) S: inserts /. |
| e) S: <i>de'ang</i> . | f) D: <i>ngas</i> for <i>des</i> . N: omits <i>des</i> . |
| g) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | h) L: ' <i>deg</i> for ' <i>jog</i> . |
| i) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | |
| j) S: one space. F: may read <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> for <i>srung sa</i> ? | |
| k) F: <i>tsha</i> looks like <i>na</i> with the "flag" of <i>tsha</i> on the right shoulder. | |
| l) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | m) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| n) S: inserts <i>dang ldan pa</i> . | o) N: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . |
| p) F: <i>tu</i> for <i>du</i> . | q) M: <i>phyiro</i> . |

L12

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) M: <i>thamd</i> . | b) L: omits <i>kyang</i> . |
| c) F: inserts /. | d) F: omits <i>na</i> . |
| e) L: omits /. | f) M: ' <i>am</i> . |
| g) B: omits /. | h) B: ' <i>chags</i> for ' <i>chag sa</i> . |
| i) N: ' <i>am</i> for <i>ngam</i> . | j) F: inserts <i>na</i> . |
| k) S: omits the phrase <i>kun dga' ra ba 'am</i> /. | l) N: <i>dga'i</i> for <i>dga'</i> . |
| m) F: omits the phrase <i>kun dga' ra ba'i gzhi 'am</i> /. | n) B: <i>nas</i> for <i>dam</i> . |
| o) F: <i>ca</i> . | p) B: omits <i>mal cha 'am</i> /. |
| q) L: omits /. | M: ' <i>am</i> //. |
| s) P: <i>dang</i> . | r) M: <i>thamd</i> . |
| u) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . P: <i>srud</i> . | t) F: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| w) P: /. | v) F: omits <i>khyod</i> . |
| | x) J: /for // (?). |

L13

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) L: <i>rtse'i</i> for <i>rtse mo'i</i> . |
| c) L: inserts <i>bar</i> . | d) P: /. |

- | | |
|---|---|
| e) F: wrote <i>sangyas</i> , corrected into <i>ngas</i> . | f) F: <i>ma</i> of <i>mtsho</i> written below line. |
| g) S: <i>rnams</i> . | h) L: omits /. |
| i) F: <i>brtan</i> . | j) M: <i>phyiro</i> . |
| k) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | l) F: ' of <i>'bul</i> written below line. |
| m) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | n) P: ' <i>tshal</i> . |
| o) B: <i>dang</i> for <i>dad</i> . | p) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| q) S: <i>sbyad</i> . | r) S: <i>na'ang</i> . |
| s) S: omits /. | t) F: <i>pa</i> . |
| u) L: inserts <i>shas</i> . | v) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| w) D <i>bar</i> . | x) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| y) L: inserts /. | |

L14

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) F: <i>brgya</i> . | b) B: <i>dus</i> for <i>ngus</i> . |
| c) F: <i>gzags</i> for <i>zag</i> . | d) F: <i>shing</i> for <i>cing</i> . L: inserts /. |
| e) N: <i>gus</i> for <i>gum</i> . | f) Śikṣ P: omits /. |
| g) F: end of line may insert /? | h) M: <i>bcomds</i> . |
| i) F: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | j) P: //. |
| k) J: /for //. | l) F: <i>mtshan</i> . |
| m) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | n) L: ' <i>jig</i> for ' <i>jigs</i> . |
| o) L: ' <i>jig par lta ba rnam pa 'di lta</i> all written in a space of about four letters. | q) J: /for //. |
| p) M: <i>gsungs</i> . | |

L15

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| a) D <i>sbyong</i> . | b) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| c) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | d) B: <i>pa'o</i> for <i>ba'o</i> . |
| e) J: /for //. | f) L: <i>ste</i> for <i>te</i> . |
| g) M: <i>tham</i> . | h) N: omits <i>ni</i> . |
| i) M: <i>rnam</i> . | j) P: one space erasure here. |
| k) J: /for //. | l) B: <i>nga</i> for <i>de</i> . |
| m) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | n) N: omits <i>pa</i> . |
| o) F: <i>ca</i> . | p) M: omits /. |
| q) L: //for /. | r) N: inserts <i>ni</i> . |
| s) M: <i>tham</i> . | t) F: <i>ba</i> of <i>bsngal</i> written below line. |
| u) Śikṣ P: omits /. | v) F: <i>las</i> written below line. |
| w) J: <i>rtog</i> for <i>rtogs</i> . | x) Śikṣ P: <i>pa</i> for <i>pas</i> . |
| y) J: <i>kyi</i> for <i>gyi</i> . | z) N: <i>kham</i> for <i>kham</i> . |
| aa) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | ab) J: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . |
| ac) L: omits <i>dag</i> . | ad) P: <i>bas</i> . |
| ae) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | af) F: <i>sbyad</i> . |
| ag) M: <i>rnam</i> . | ah) J: /for //. |
| ai) F: <i>snyams</i> . | aj) F: <i>snyogs</i> . |
| ak) M: <i>ba'i</i> . | |

L16

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| a) N: omits <i>dang</i> . | b) P: <i>dad</i> . |
| c) M: <i>rnam</i> . | d) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |

- | | |
|--|--|
| e) M: <i>rnamr</i> . | f) S: <i>pa'ang</i> . |
| g) B: <i>nad</i> for <i>tshad</i> . | h) L: <i>po'i</i> , for space. |
| i) S: <i>rnams</i> . | j) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| k) J: omits <i>gang</i> . | l) M: <i>srung</i> . |
| m) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | n) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . N: <i>bas</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| o) P: <i>ba'i</i> . | p) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| q) N: omits <i>lta</i> . | r) N: omits <i>.</i> |
| s) L: inserts <i>dri</i> . | t) F: <i>drangs</i> for <i>drang</i> . N: <i>dang</i> for <i>drang</i> . |
| u) N: <i>gyur</i> for <i>gyu</i> ? (<i>ra</i> unclear). | v) F: <i>da</i> written and cancelled. |
| w) M: inserts <i>.</i> | x) D <i>spong</i> . |
| y) F: <i>par</i> . | z) J: <i>/for //</i> . |

L17

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) B: <i>mi gnas</i> for <i>mig nas</i> . |
| c) S: omits. | d) J: <i>/for //</i> . |
| e) F: <i>ra</i> written below <i>gi</i> . | f) F: omits <i>pa</i> . |
| g) M: <i>bar</i> . | h) N: omits <i>.</i> |
| i) M: omits <i>ldan pa dang</i> . | j) P: <i>//</i> . |
| k) F: <i>pas</i> . | l) J: <i>/for //</i> . F: inserts <i>//</i> . |
| m) J: <i>/for //</i> . | |

II.1

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) J: <i>dag</i> for <i>dge</i> (broken?). | b) J: <i>/for //</i> . |
| c) M: <i>sernn</i> . | d) F: <i>du</i> . |
| e) F: <i>khye'u du</i> for <i>khye'ur</i> . | f) P: <i>// for /</i> . |
| g) L: omits <i>dge slong</i> . | h) J: <i>/for //</i> . |
| i) D <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | j) F: <i>can</i> written and cancelled. |
| k) L: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . | l) L: <i>'jigs</i> for <i>'jig</i> . |
| m) F: <i>'jigs med</i> for <i>'jig pa</i> . | n) F: <i>thamd</i> . |
| o) N: <i>las</i> for <i>dang</i> . | p) J: <i>mad</i> for <i>med</i> (broken?). |
| q) P: <i>//</i> . | r) J: <i>/for //</i> . |

II.2

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) L: omits <i>ngo</i> . |
| c) F: <i>bas</i> . | d) F: <i>par</i> . |
| e) S: <i>nga'ang</i> for <i>nga yang</i> . | f) S: <i>de'ang</i> , P: one space before <i>yang</i> . |
| g) P: <i>nge'i</i> or <i>de'i</i> for <i>nga'i</i> . | h) J: <i>/for //</i> . |

II.3

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | d) S: <i>cad</i> added below line. |
| b) B: <i>dge slong</i> for <i>dag</i> . P: space of two letters. | f) B: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| c) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | h) M: inserts <i>.</i> |
| e) N: omits <i>'di</i> . | j) M: omits <i>ba</i> . |
| g) B: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | l) P: <i>bstan pa nub par</i> cramped. |
| i) L: <i>ngas</i> for <i>nges</i> . | |
| k) F: <i>stan</i> , or <i>ba</i> written small below line (unclear). | |

- m) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- o) S: inserts /.
- q) M: *se*.
- s) P: space of two letters here before *ri*.
- u) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- w) M: *ba* for *pa*.
- y) M: *ba* for *pa*.
- aa) F: omits *nga'i*.

- n) F: *ltar*.
- p) F: inserts *mtshan*, cancelled.
- r) B: *myi* for *mi*.
- t) F: *la* written below line.
- v) M: inserts /.
- x) N: omits /.
- z) N: omits /.

II.4

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- c) B: omits /.
- e) F: *da* for *de*.

- b) S: inserts '*dod*'.
- d) L: *nga'i* for *nga'o*.
- f) L: *dago*.

II.5

- a) N: inserts *ta?* almost illegible.
- c) F: *dang* for *ste*.

- b) P: *ba* for *pa*.
- d) N: omits /.

II.6

- a) F: //.
- c) M: *ba* for *pa*.

- b) B: '*dong* for '*dod*'.

II.7

- a) P: omits /.
- c) N: omits /.

- b) N: *pas* for *par*.
- d) L: *dago*.

II.8

- a) L: *bzo* for *gzo*.
- c) N: omits /.

- b) B: *po* for *bo*. N: omits *bo*.
- d) D: // for / after first syllable of line.

II.9

- a) N: *dang* for *dad*.
- c) M: *ba* for *pa*.
- e) B: *gsong ba* for *gsod pa*.
- g) F: omits *bzhi po de dag go* /.

- b) P: *bas*.
- d) L: *lhung* for *ltung*.
- f) M: omits *ba*.

II.10

- a) M: *señn*.
- c) N: omits /.

- b) J: omits / [end of folio].

II.11

- a) F: //.

- b) F: *bslabs*.

II.12

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| a) L: <i>yang</i> for <i>la</i> . | b) F: <i>lags</i> . |
| c) M: <i>pa</i> . | d) M: <i>bar</i> . |
| e) B: <i>rgyad</i> for <i>rgyang</i> . | f) M: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . |
| g) N: omits /. | |

II.13

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| a) M: space of two letters. | b) P: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| c) F: <i>gshes</i> . | |

II.14

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| a) F: <i>rmangs</i> . | b) L: inserts /. |
| c) B: <i>gnying</i> for <i>gnyid</i> . | |
| d) F: omits <i>mi</i> . Something is erased here, probably <i>ba</i> but almost certainly not <i>mi</i> . | |
| e) P: omits /. | |

II.15

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| a) B: <i>rus</i> for <i>rul</i> . | b) J: space between <i>yi</i> and <i>na</i> . |
| c) N: omits /. | d) M: //after first syllable of line. |

II.16

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| a) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | b) S: <i>gdungs</i> . |
| c) P: <i>pas</i> . | d) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| e) P: <i>pas</i> . | f) M: <i>thamd</i> . |
| g) F: <i>pas</i> for <i>bas</i> . | |
| h) N: <i>gdung</i> for <i>gdungs</i> . B: omits <i>bas yongs su gdungs</i> . | |

II.17

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| a) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | b) F: ' <i>gyur</i> . |
| c) L: <i>sems can</i> for <i>thams cad</i> . M: <i>thamd</i> . | d) L: <i>yongsu</i> . |
| e) N: // for /. | f) N: omits /. |
| g) L: <i>dago</i> . | |

II.18

- | | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| a) L: <i>pas</i> for <i>bas</i> . | b) N: one letter space. |
| c) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | d) N: // for /. |
| e) B: <i>par</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . P: space of one letter after <i>pa'i</i> . | f) B: <i>pa'i</i> for <i>pas</i> . |
| g) B: <i>bcang</i> for <i>bcad</i> . | h) M: inserts /. |
| i) N: omits /. | j) L: <i>dago</i> . |
| k) L: //for /, at end of line. | |

II.19

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| a) F: <i>ma</i> for <i>pa</i> . | b) N: omits /. |
|---------------------------------|----------------|

- c) L: *dago*.

II.20

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) B: <i>ngal</i> for <i>dal</i> . | b) F: <i>gnya</i> . |
| c) N: <i>zhing</i> for <i>bar</i> . | |
| d) B: <i>gon</i> for <i>gyon</i> . F: <i>bgyon</i> written, and <i>ba</i> cancelled. P: <i>ya-btags</i> added later? | |
| e) F: 'written below line. | |
| f) M: inserts another <i>pa</i> , the first at the end of one line, the next at the beginning of the next. | |
| g) S: ' <i>tshol</i> . F: <i>mitsho</i> . | h) F: <i>na</i> for <i>la</i> . |
| i) F: <i>ma</i> for <i>pa</i> . | j) M: inserts another /. |
| k) F: <i>nams</i> for <i>snayoms</i> . | l) M: inserts /. |
| m) P: adds another /. | n) B: ' <i>tshol</i> written, and ' cancelled. |
| o) M: <i>bskus</i> . | p) N: omits /. |

II.21

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) M: inserts /. | |
| b) M: <i>bo</i> for <i>bos</i> . N: omits <i>te / kho bos</i> (haplography). | |
| c) S: omits <i>gang</i> . | d) N: inserts /. |
| e) N: <i>bstang</i> for <i>stang</i> . | f) L: <i>pa</i> for <i>nas</i> . |
| g) P: <i>pzang</i> (broken?). | h) S: <i>med</i> . |
| i) M: adds /. | j) N: omits <i>lan</i> . |
| k) F: inserts <i>lan</i> . | l) M: omits <i>kho bos mang du thos</i> /. |
| m) F: <i>bos</i> . | n) N: omits <i>dang</i> . |
| o) F: <i>bos</i> . | p) N: <i>bos</i> for ' <i>os</i> . |
| q) F: <i>bos</i> . | r) J: space of two letters. |
| s) P: <i>ba'i</i> . | t) F: inserts <i>pa</i> . |
| u) F: <i>bos</i> . | v) N: <i>bskal</i> for <i>skal</i> . |
| w) P: space of two letters. | x) F: ' <i>thu</i> . |
| y) F: <i>bos</i> . | z) M: <i>stan</i> . |
| aa) S: <i>pa la</i> cramped and re-written. | ab) P: space of one letter. |
| ac) N: space of four letters at end of line. | ad) M: adds another /. |
| ae) F: <i>mgur</i> . | af) L: <i>bo</i> for <i>bos</i> . |
| ag) M: <i>bo</i> . | |
| ah) B: omits <i>kho bo</i> . L: <i>bos</i> for <i>bo</i> . N: <i>ba</i> for <i>bo</i> . | |
| ai) L: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . | aj) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| ak) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | al) N: <i>byung</i> for ' <i>byung</i> . |
| am) M: <i>tharid</i> . | an) B: <i>dag</i> for <i>ngag</i> . |
| ao) L: <i>kyis</i> for <i>kyi</i> . | ap) F: omits <i>te</i> . |
| aq) N: omits /. | ar) B: <i>dag</i> for <i>ngag</i> . |

II.22

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) N: <i>chos</i> for ' <i>chos</i> . |
| c) N: inserts <i>yin</i> . | d) P: <i>sa</i> written small, followed by space. |
| e) S: <i>ci'ang</i> . | f) L: omits /, end of line. |
| g) L: ' <i>thos</i> for ' <i>chos</i> . | |

II.23

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) L: inserts <i>ba</i> . | b) F: inserts <i>du</i> . |
| c) F: <i>sma</i> . | d) F: /. |
| e) L: <i>nyid</i> for <i>yii</i> . | f) F: /. |
| g) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>yang</i> . P: // <i>nam yang</i> written small and cramped. | |
| h) B: <i>de ba na</i> for <i>bde ba</i> . P: one letter space after <i>ba</i> . | |
| i) M: inserts <i>ba</i> . | j) F: /. |
| k) N: <i>chos</i> for ' <i>chos</i> '. | l) B: <i>lta?</i> somehow corrected, but unclear. |
| m) F: /. | n) F: <i>dang</i> written below line. |
| o) B: <i>par</i> for <i>bar</i> . | p) F: /. |
| q) F: <i>dga'</i> . | r) F: /. |
| s) S: space of two letters. | t) P: has only /. |

II.24

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) F: omits <i>ldan pa</i> . |
| c) F: <i>tshig</i> for <i>cho ga</i> . | d) N: omits <i>bu</i> . L: inserts /. |
| e) M: <i>semn</i> . | f) S: <i>rjes</i> . |
| g) F: ' <i>gyuro</i> for ' <i>gyur ba'o</i> '. N: <i>no</i> for <i>ba'o</i> . | h) F: inserts //. |
| i) F: inserts //. L: inserts /. | |

III.1

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) P: omits //. | b) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| c) N: inserts /. | d) J: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . |
| e) F: writes <i>pa</i> below line. | f) L: inserts ' <i>ang</i> '. |
| g) M: <i>yino</i> . | h) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| i) S: <i>bu'ang</i> . | j) F: <i>shes</i> . |
| k) F: <i>pa</i> . | l) P: one letter space. |
| m) F: <i>bstis</i> . | n) F: inserts /. |
| o) L: omits <i>chos</i> . | p) B: <i>le ra</i> for <i>la re</i> . |
| q) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | |

III.2

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| c) F: <i>dge slob dpan</i> for <i>tshong dpon</i> . | d) B: omits /. N: omits <i>dang</i> /. |
| e) N: inserts <i>de</i> . | |
| f) B: <i>spyad par</i> for <i>spang bar</i> . P: may have been corrected (based on size of <i>pa</i>). | |
| g) L: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . | h) S: <i>bo</i> . |
| i) N: <i>spang</i> for <i>spong</i> ? | j) F: <i>spongo</i> . |
| k) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | l) F: <i>sbyong</i> . J: inserts /, end of line. |
| m) P: omits /. | n) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| o) L: <i>spangs par</i> for <i>spang bar</i> . | p) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| q) S: ' <i>a</i> written below <i>pa</i> . | r) B: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . |
| s) F: <i>spongo</i> . | |

III.3

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) L: <i>spyod</i> for <i>spyad</i> . |
|--|---------------------------------------|

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| c) M: <i>thamd.</i> | d) F: inserts /. |
| e) J: <i>rig</i> for <i>reg.</i> | f) J: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi.</i> |
| g) M: <i>spyodo.</i> | h) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> |
| i) B: <i>lung</i> for <i>lhung.</i> | j) N: omits <i>de.</i> |
| k) M: <i>thamd.</i> | l) L: omits <i>mi.</i> |
| m) M: <i>ba'i.</i> | n) L: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba.</i> |
| o) N: inserts /. | p) L: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba.</i> |
| q) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa.</i> | r) S: omits /. |
| s) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa.</i> | |

III.4

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> | b) S: inserts /. |
| c) F: inserts <i>de.</i> | d) N: <i>khyis</i> for <i>kha phyis.</i> |
| e) L: omits /. | f) L: <i>bur</i> for <i>por.</i> S: <i>bor</i> for <i>por.</i> |
| g) F: omits <i>gzhan.</i> | h) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> |
| i) S: <i>bu'ang.</i> | j) F: <i>par.</i> |
| k) N: / for //. | l) L: inserts /. |
| m) F: omits <i>gzhan gyi khyim du 'gro'o //</i> . | n) L: <i>te</i> for <i>nas.</i> |
| o) M: <i>byedo.</i> | p) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> |
| q) N: inserts <i>phan</i> (or <i>pan?</i>). | r) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa.</i> |
| s) M: <i>thamd.</i> | t) L: <i>mchis</i> for <i>yin.</i> |
| u) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa.</i> | v) N: <i>stags</i> for <i>brtags?</i> |

III.5

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> | b) L: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i.</i> |
| c) N: seems to be missing /, but perhaps broken? space of two letters. | |
| d) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> | e) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa.</i> |
| f) L: <i>'gro</i> for <i>'gror.</i> | g) J: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi.</i> |
| h) L: <i>nga</i> for <i>de.</i> | i) S: <i>sum.</i> |
| j) F: <i>bsgrib.</i> | k) L: <i>do</i> for <i>de.</i> |
| l) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> | m) S: <i>bur.</i> |

III.6

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> | b) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa.</i> |
| c) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> | d) S: inserts /. |
| e) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa.</i> | f) S: inserts /. |
| g) S: <i>zhing.</i> | h) F: <i>'gyur ba</i> for <i>gyur pa.</i> |
| i) M: <i>yino.</i> | j) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> |
| k) S: <i>ba'ang.</i> | l) F: omits <i>ro.</i> |
| m) F: omits <i>dang.</i> | n) M: omits <i>dang bral ba.</i> |
| o) M: omits <i>mi.</i> | p) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa.</i> |
| q) M: adds another /. | r) S: <i>du'ang.</i> |
| s) L: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i.</i> | t) M: <i>ba'i.</i> |
| u) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung.</i> | |

III.7

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . F: 'do small, and <i>srung</i> written below line. | |
| b) S: inserts /. | c) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| d) B: <i>mithungs</i> for 'thungs. | e) L: inserts /. |
| f) L: <i>zags</i> for <i>gzags</i> . | g) F: inserts /. |
| h) F: omits <i>ba</i> . | i) N: beginning of line looks like 'in? |
| j) L: erasure of one letter here. | k) B: <i>par</i> for <i>bar</i> . |
| l) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | m) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| n) S: <i>ba'ang</i> . | o) L: inserts /. |
| p) S: inserts /. | q) J: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . |
| r) F: <i>bo</i> . | s) M: adds another /. |
| t) N: <i>shes</i> for <i>zhes</i> . | |

III.8

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) S: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| c) F: inserts /. J: space of one letter. | d) L: <i>skye ru</i> for <i>skyer</i> . |
| e) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | f) L: <i>slong</i> for <i>sbyong</i> . |
| g) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | h) M: <i>rnair</i> . |
| i) F: inserts <i>pa</i> . | j) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |

III.9

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) M: <i>giog</i> written, and <i>ga</i> erased. |
| c) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | d) S: inserts /. |
| e) B: <i>thog</i> for <i>tog</i> . S: inserts <i>gi</i> . | f) J: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . |
| g) B: <i>thog</i> for <i>tog</i> . | h) S: <i>bu'ang</i> . F: inserts /. |
| i) B: <i>phyir</i> for <i>phyi</i> . F: <i>phi</i> for <i>phyi</i> . | j) F: omits <i>sbra</i> . |
| k) F: 'gyur. | l) F: <i>gi</i> . |
| m) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | n) B: <i>thog</i> for <i>tog</i> . |

III.10

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) F: <i>ra</i> written and cancelled at end of line. |
| c) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | d) S: omits <i>ka</i> . |
| e) F: <i>dug</i> . | |
| f) B: <i>na</i> for <i>la</i> . L: inserts /. P: <i>sdug</i> small, and following letter small and illegible. | |
| g) S: inserts /. | |
| h) B: <i>pa'i</i> for <i>ba'i</i> . F: <i>ba</i> for <i>ba'i</i> , and inserts <i>dang</i> /. | |
| i) B: <i>ma rnam</i> for <i>mnam</i> . P: the whole expression <i>lta na sdug la reg na rtsub pa lci ba'i sbrang ma'i dri mnam</i> (end of line) cramped slightly. | |
| j) L: inserts /. | k) L: <i>shing</i> for <i>shi</i> . |
| l) D space of one letter. L: <i>ma</i> for <i>mi</i> . | m) J: /for //. |
| n) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | o) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>bu</i> . |
| p) S: <i>bu'ang</i> . F: inserts /. | q) L: <i>brlabs pa</i> for <i>brlang ba</i> . B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| r) B: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | s) F: <i>nyam</i> . |
| t) F: film very faint, but probably <i>rnam</i> . | u) B: <i>kur</i> for <i>ku</i> . |
| v) F: inserts //. | w) B: <i>pas</i> for <i>bas</i> . |
| x) L: omits <i>po bas kyang ring</i> (haplography). | |
| y) L: omits <i>can</i> . | |
| z) M: omits <i>bu'i dge sbyong de lta</i> (haplography). | |

- aa) F: *ba* for *bu*.
 ac) P: *psnyen* (broken?).
 ae) F: omits /.
 ag) F: //.

- ab) F: inserts /.
 ad) M: *byede*.
 af) F: *rad*.
 ah) S: *srungs* for *srung*.

III.11

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*. F: *bsrung*.
 c) F: //.
 e) S: inserts /.
 g) F: //.
 i) F: *cing* for *pa*.
 k) F: *ca*.
 m) B: omits /.
 o) B: '*dug* for *gdug*. F: *gdugs* for *gdug*, and inserts *pa* //. N: *bdug* for *gdug*. P: corrected?
 p) L: inserts /.
 r) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 t) F: *mar* for *bar ram*.
 v) F: *des*.
 x) S: inserts /.
 z) P: *gyi phung* cramped.
 ab) F: inserts *da*.
 ad) L: inserts *ngo*.
 af) F: *kun*.
 ah) S: *gis*.
 aj) F: *chos*.
 al) F: *snyed*.
 re?
 an) F: //.
 ap) N: omits *ram* /.
 ar) B: '*am* for *lam*. F: *brdal 'am* for *rdal lam*.
 at) F: //.
 av) F: //.
 ax) F: *ba* for *pa*.
 az) F: //.
 bb) F: //.
 bd) F: //.
 bf) F: inserts *sde*.
 bg) B: *bskrang* for *bskrad*. F: *bskad* for *bskrad*.
 bi) F: omits *rtag tu*.
 bk) M: *thamd*.
 bm) F: '*od de* for '*ong ngo*.
 bo) F: *rkum*.
 bq) L: '*grengo*.
 bs) F: *kun*.
 bu) F: //.
 bw) P: /.
 by) P: /? Not clear.
 ca) P: /.
 cc) F: '*thun do* for '*thung ngo*. N: '*thungo*.
 b) F: *bu*.
 d) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 f) S: omits /. F: //.
 h) F: *bar*.
 j) F: // L: omits /.
 l) F: *thog*.
 n) F: *mtshar*.
 q) B: '*dug* for *gdug*.
 s) B: *par* for *bar*.
 u) F: //.
 w) B: *ji* for '*di*.
 y) F: *la* for *gi*.
 aa) B: *gang* for *gir*.
 ac) F: *ste*.
 ae) P: space of four letters.
 ag) F: *nan*.
 ai) F: *snyed*.
 ak) F: //.
 am) F: *la re* written below line. N: *rag* for
 ao) B: *par* for *bar*. F: *ba* for *bar*.
 aq) B: '*am* for *ram*. P: *lam* for *ram*.
 as) F: *de*.
 au) N: *brnyed* for *rnyed*.
 aw) M: *thamd*.
 ay) F: inserts *te*.
 ba) B: *sped* for *sbed*.
 bc) F: *ge*.
 be) F: inserts *da*.
 bh) S: inserts /.
 bj) F: '*jig*.
 bl) P: two letter space.
 bn) F: *rkum*.
 bp) F: '*dreng*.
 br) P: / for //.
 bt) F: *chag*.
 bv) F: //.
 bx) F: *kun*.
 bz) F: *kun*.
 cb) F: *kun*.
 cd) P: /.

ce) F: 'dregs. N: 'drego.

III.12

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) S: one letter space. |
| c) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | d) F: omits <i>la</i> . |
| e) F: <i>brtag</i> . | f) F: //. |
| g) M: <i>bcorids</i> | h) F: <i>myi</i> . |
| i) F: <i>bar</i> . | j) B: <i>par</i> for <i>pa</i> . M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| k) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | l) S: inserts /. |
| m) L: <i>sbying</i> very small, and <i>dang</i> omitted, at end of line. | o) F: inserts <i>dang</i> . |
| n) F: omits /. | q) F: <i>brtan</i> . |
| p) L: inserts /. | s) P: <i>zhas</i> (broken?) |
| r) F: <i>pa'i</i> . B: inserts //. P: inserts /. | u) F: <i>skyedo</i> . |
| t) F: <i>par</i> . | w) F: <i>brtan</i> . |
| v) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | z) F: <i>myi</i> . |
| x) F: <i>rlab</i> for <i>la rab</i> , or is the <i>la</i> written below <i>rab</i> intended to come before <i>rab</i> as a separate word? | |
| y) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . | |
| aa) L: <i>bskyed</i> for <i>skyed</i> . | ac) B: <i>lha</i> for <i>lta</i> . |
| ab) S: <i>skyed na</i> written small, probably corrected. | ae) F: <i>myed</i> . |
| ad) F: <i>nas</i> for <i>gnas</i> . | ag) P: <i>dag</i> (broken?) |
| af) M: <i>medo</i> . | |

III.13

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) S: space of four letters at beginning of line. | b) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| c) F: <i>bzhin du</i> for <i>la</i> . | d) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| e) F: <i>min</i> for <i>smin</i> . | f) F: 'ong. |
| g) N: <i>gi</i> for <i>ni</i> . | h) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| i) S: insert /. | j) L: <i>tam</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| k) N: omits /. P: // for /. | l) F: <i>kyi</i> . |
| m) M: <i>thamd</i> . F: <i>thamd</i> . | |
| n) F: 'phrog for 'phrogs. L: <i>phogs</i> for 'phrogs. | q) F: omits /. |
| o) B: <i>g-yangs</i> for <i>g-yengs</i> . F: <i>g-yeng</i> for <i>g-yengs</i> . | s) S: <i>sbyong</i> . |
| p) F: <i>de</i> for <i>ste</i> . | u) F: <i>dag</i> for <i>dags</i> . L: <i>dwags</i> for <i>dags</i> . |
| r) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | w) F: omits <i>ni</i> . |
| t) F: 'ishal for 'chal. | |
| v) N: omits <i>te</i> /, but text here has been "corrected." | |
| x) P: <i>nges</i> . | |

III.14

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) L: space of one letter. |
| c) F: //. | d) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| e) M: <i>las</i> . | f) P: one letter space. |
| g) F: <i>rtag</i> . | h) F: <i>gi</i> . |
| i) M: <i>thamd</i> . | j) M: <i>ba'i</i> . |
| k) B: omits <i>skyed</i> . L: <i>bskyed bskyed</i> for <i>skyed skyed</i> . | |
| l) F: <i>ljan</i> . | m) S: <i>rnyem</i> for <i>snye ma</i> . |
| n) F: 'gyur. | o) F: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |

- p) P: one letter space.
 r) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 t) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 v) M: *ba'i*.
 x) L: inserts *dang*.
 z) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 ab) L: *pa dag* for *bdag*.
 ad) N: *slong* for *sbyong*.
 af) F: inserts *pa*.
 ah) F: *ti*.
 aj) F: omits *la*.
 al) J: omits /, with space of one letter.
 an) S: *gyi nang nas* very cramped.
 ap) P: end of one line and beginning of next, two blank spaces in each.
 aq) J: space of one letter.
 as) M: *señn*.
 au) A [end of line]: omits /. F: //.
 aw) A: inserts *gyi*.
 ay) F: //.
 ba) F: *gnas*.
 bc) S: *la'ang*.
 be) N: *medo*.
 bg) A: *do* for *de*.
 bi) A: *sund* for *sun*.
- q) M: *'byungo*.
 s) F: omits /.
 u) F: //.
 w) F: *rnam*.
 y) F: 'written below line.
 aa) F: omits /.
 ac) F: omits *dag*.
 ae) L: *bskyed* for *skyed*.
 ag) N: inserts /.
 ai) F: //.
 ak) M: *mkhas*.
 am) S: *zhing*.
 ao) F: //.
 ar) F: inserts /.
 at) N: *skye* for *skyes*.
 av) M: inserts /.
 ax) M: *señn*.
 az) F: omits *la*.
 bb) A: *myed* for *med*.
 bd) A: *myed* for *med*.
 bf) B: *med* for *skyed*. L: *bskyed* for *skyed*.
 bh) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 bj) M: *bar*.

III.15

- a) A: *'chos* for *bcos*.
 c) S: inserts /.
 e) A: omits /, end of line.
 g) J: *du* for *tu*.
 h) A: *byang* for *sbyang*. P: *sbyangs* for *sbyang*? (end of line, unclear).
 i) A: *shind* for *shin*.
 k) A: *'ond* for *'on*.
 m) F: *bder* for *bdar*.
 o) P: *pa'i*.
 q) A: *'chos* for *bcos*.
 s) J: *du* for *tu*.
 u) B: *gon* for *gyon*. P: *ya-btags* added later?
 w) F: omits *gi*.
 y) M: *thamd*.
 aa) P: // for /.
 ac) B: *pa* for *ba*.
 ae) A: *'dzind* for *'dzin*.
 ag) F: *sti* for *stis*. L: *bstis* for *stis*.
 ai) B: omits /.
 ak) F: *gyi*.
 am) A: *'khold* for *'khol*. L: *'khor* for *'khol*.
 ao) A: *lend* for *len*.
 aq) A: *lend* for *len*.
- b) F: //.
 d) N: *yode*?
 f) A: *shind* for *shin*.
 j) J: *du* for *tu*.
 l) A: *tang* for *thang*.
 n) F: // for /. L: omits /..
 p) M: *yino*.
 r) A: *shind* for *shin*.
 t) F: inserts //.
 v) F: //.
 x) A: *rold kyi* for *rol gyi*.
 z) A: *tu* for *du*. F: writes *du* below line.
 ab) F: *bskums*.
 ad) N: *rnam* for *snam*.
 af) L: *par* for *pa*.
 ah) F: writes *nga* below line.
 aj) F: //.
 al) F: //.
 an) A: *pa* for *ba*. F: *'khor lo* for *'khor ba*.
 ap) A: *myi* for *mi*. N: omits *mi*.
 ar) A: *myi* for *mi*.

- as) F: //.
- au) A: *myi* for *mi*. F: omits *mi*.
- aw) F: //.
- ay) L: omits *ma*.
- ba) A: *myi* for *mi*.
- bc) A: *lend* for *len*.
- be) A: *myi* for *mi*.
- bg) J: omits /, one letter space.
- bi) L: *bsti* for *sti*.
- bk) F: *grag*.
- bm) F: *rims*.
- bn) B: *rim gror* miscopied as *ri 'gror*. F: '*gror* for *gror*. L: *gro* for *gror*.
- bo) A: *myi* for *mi*.
- bq) S: *sbag pa sna* written small.
- bs) F: *bas*.
- bu) S: *kyis*.
- bw) N: inserts /.
- by) L: *rjesu*.
- ca) F: //.
- cc) M: *thamd*.
- ce) N: omits *rjes su chags pa dang khong khro bas bcom pa yin te / de'i dge sbyong gi cho ga dang / spyod lam thams cad dang / sems dang sems las byung ba'i chos thams cad ni sems can dmyal ba dang /*
- cf) P: '*gro*'.
- ch) L: omits *gi*.
- cj) A: *ka* for *kha*. F: *ga* for *kha*.
- cl) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- at) A: *lend* for *len*.
- av) A: *lend ba* for *len pa*.
- ax) A: *rold* for *rol*.
- az) F: '*jig rten* for '*jigs*.
- bb) J: omits /, one letter space.
- bd) J: *che* for *tshe*.
- bf) A: *lend* for *len*.
- bh) F: *lu* for *lus*.
- bj) F: omits *dang*.
- bl) F: omits *la*.
- bp) A: *rtend* for *rten*.
- br) S: one letter erased here.
- bt) A: *bgos* for *bsgos*.
- bv) F: omits *la*.
- bx) L: inserts *ba*.
- bz) A: *ba* for *pa*.
- cb) M: *thamd*.
- cd) M: *semin*.
- cg) F: *rje*.
- ci) M: *sras*.
- ck) A: *myi* for *mi*.
- cm) A: '*chos* for *bcos*.

III.16

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- b) L: space of two letters, and inserts *mdangs*.
- d) P: space of one letter.
- f) S: inserts /.
- h) F: //.
- j) A: *myi* for *mi*.
- l) F: //.
- n) F: *mdog* repeated at end of 16a and beginning of 16b.
- o) A: *myi* for *mi*.
- q) F: //.
- s) F: '*phrog* for *phrogs*. N: '*phrogs* for *phrogs*.
- u) F: omits /.
- w) N: *kyi* for *kyis*.
- y) B: *slob* for *slon*.
- aa) F: // for /. N: omits /, with space of two letters.
- ac) A: *myi* for *mi*.
- ad) A: / for //. F: inserts '*od srung de bzhin du mi 'gyur ro* //.
- ae) N: *song* for *slong*.
- ag) F: *gzir*.
- ai) A: '*dzind kyi* for '*dzin gyi*.
- ak) A [end of folio]: omits /. F: //.
- c) F: //.
- e) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- g) A: *myed* for *med*.
- i) F: *bo*.
- k) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*.
- m) F: *gags*.
- p) F: *ste*.
- r) F: *mangs* for *mdangs*.
- t) B: *tan* for *tam*. P: *ma* a correction?
- v) F: *sngag*.
- x) A: *myi* for *mi*.
- z) F: *to*.
- ab) B: *pa* for *ba*.
- af) N: '*tshul* for *tshul*.
- ah) A: *myed* for *med*.
- aj) A: *myed* for *med*.
- al) A: *myed* for *med*.

- am) M: *rnair*.
 ao) A: *myed* for *med*.
 aq) A: *myed* for *med*.
 as) A: *myed ba* for *med pa*.
 au) A: *myed* for *med*.
 aw) F: //.
 ay) D omits /.
 ba) S: *gi yon* very cramped.
 bc) J: space of one letter.
 be) B: *sbyang* for *sbyangs*.
 bg) A: *myed* for *med*.
 bi) F: inserts //.
 bk) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 bm) A: '*phrogs* for *phrogs*. F: '*phrog* for *phrogs*.
 bn) F: // for /. L: *bya'o* // for *bya ste* /. P: space of about fifteen letters after /until the end of the line..
- an) F: *bar*.
 ap) M: *rnair*.
 ar) N: omits /, with space of two letters.
 at) A: *myed* for *med*.
 av) A: *myed* for *med*.
 ax) A: *bsdom ba* for *sdom pa*.
 az) A: *myed* for *med*.
 bb) A: *myed* for *med*.
 bd) A: *myed* for *med*.
 bf) F: *bsnyung*.
 bh) S: inserts /.
 bj) A: *myed* for *med*.
 bl) D one letter space.

III.17

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 b) F: *ggzi* (*gagazi*). D space of one letter after *gzi*.
 c) A: '*phrogs* for *phrogs*. F: '*phrog* for *phrogs*.
 e) N: space of two letters.
 g) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 i) F: //.
 k) A: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
 m) F: //.
 o) F: *cang*.
 q) F: //.
 s) F: //.
 u) A: *dgond* for *dgon*.
 w) A: '*dzind* for '*dzin*.
 y) A: *sbyard* for *sbyar*.
 aa) F: //.
 ac) M: *seinn*.
 ae) A: *myi* for *mi*.
- d) F: omits *de lta bu*.
 f) A: *sbyard* for *sbyar*.
 h) J: *ste* for *te*.
 j) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 l) N: inserts *pa*.
 n) A: *rtend* for *rten*.
 p) A: '*brel*d for '*brel*.
 r) F: *byed pa* for *bya ba*.
 t) A: '*dzind* for '*dzin*.
 v) A: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
 x) F: omits *pas*.
 z) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 ab) F: *na*.
 ad) A: *tu* for *du*?

III.18

- a) N: '*ang* for *yang*.
 c) A: omits /. F: // for /.
 e) N: space of one letter.
 g) F: //.
 i) A: *myed* for *med*.
 k) A: *myed* for *med*.
 l) F: omits *shes pa*. J: omits *pa*. N: inserts /.
 n) N: omits *lta bu* '*di*.
 p) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 r) M: *seinn*.
 t) F: *te* for *gyi*.
 v) A [end of line]: omits //.
- b) F: *sems*.
 d) J: omits /, with small space.
 f) F: *ched*.
 h) A: *rtend* for *rten*.
 j) A: *smond* for *smon*. B: *sman* for *smon*.
 m) A: *rtend* for *rten*.
 o) A: '*de* for *de*.
 q) F: //.
 s) F: *ba'i*.
 u) A: *myi* for *mi*.

III.19

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) A: <i>bstand</i> for <i>bstan</i> . | b) A: 'byord for 'byor. |
| c) L: inserts <i>pa stong</i> . | d) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . F: <i>gyu</i> for <i>gyur</i> . |
| e) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | f) F: <i>snyam</i> . |
| g) A: /for //. | h) F: omits <i>de la</i> . |
| i) F: one space. | j) A: 'byord for 'byor. |
| k) A: <i>bstand</i> for <i>bstan</i> . | l) A: <i>la</i> for <i>las</i> . |
| m) A: <i>shind</i> for <i>shin</i> . | n) L: <i>bya'o</i> for 'phya'o. |

III.20

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) M: <i>bcomds</i> . | b) N: <i>kyi</i> for <i>kyis</i> . |
| c) A: <i>stsald</i> for <i>stsal</i> . | d) A: <i>bstand</i> for <i>bstan</i> . |
| e) L: <i>la</i> for <i>las</i> . | f) A: <i>shind</i> for <i>shin</i> . |
| g) J: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . L: omits <i>shin tu</i> . | h) A: inserts <i>dag</i> . |
| i) A: <i>shind</i> for <i>shin</i> . | j) J: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . |
| k) N: <i>zhe</i> for <i>zhes</i> , or subjoined <i>sa</i> ? | l) M: omits /. |
| m) F: <i>de'i</i> . | n) F: <i>phyin</i> ? |
| o) F: //. | p) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| q) F: inserts //. | r) A: <i>dang ba</i> for <i>dad pa</i> . |
| s) P: three spaces here at beginning of line. | u) A: <i>bstand</i> for <i>bstan</i> . |
| t) A: inserts <i>dang</i> /. N: <i>med pa</i> for <i>mang ba</i> . | w) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| v) A: inserts <i>pa</i> . | y) S: <i>pa</i> . |
| x) F: inserts //. L: inserts /. | aa) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| z) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . | ac) F: <i>to</i> . |
| ab) A: <i>ston</i> for <i>ston</i> . L: <i>bstan</i> for <i>ston</i> . | ae) F: inserts //. |
| ad) A: omits /. F: // for /. | ag) |
| af) P: <i>ltan</i> for <i>ldan</i> . B: <i>dga' ldan</i> inserted below line. | |
| F: <i>lha</i> . | |
| ah) F: <i>rigs</i> for <i>ris</i> . | ai) P: space of four letters after <i>bzhin</i> . |
| aj) A: <i>gdold</i> for <i>gdol</i> . | ak) L: inserts /. |
| al) P: omits //. L: inserts 'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po chos kyi le'u stong phrag brgya pa /. | |

IV.1

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) M: <i>bcomds</i> . | b) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| c) F: <i>po'i</i> . | d) A: <i>gsold</i> for <i>gsol</i> . |
| e) B: <i>ta</i> written <i>te</i> , with <i>e</i> erased, and below in next two occurrences. | |
| f) A: <i>stsald</i> for <i>stsal</i> . | g) F: //. |
| h) J: inserts / [end of line]. | i) F: <i>ge'i</i> . |
| j) F: <i>to</i> . | k) F: // for /. L: omits /. |
| l) F: //. | m) A: <i>rold</i> for <i>rol</i> . |
| n) J: space of one letter. | o) F: 'jig pa for 'jigs par. |
| p) F: omits <i>las kyi</i> . | q) F: <i>rnams</i> . |
| r) M: <i>rnair</i> . | s) A: <i>smind</i> for <i>smin</i> . |
| t) L: <i>ston</i> for <i>rton</i> . | u) A: omits /. F: // for /. |
| v) N: <i>mdzem</i> for 'dzem. | w) A: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------------|
| x) | F: inserts /. | y) | A: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| z) | M: <i>bar</i> . | aa) | A: <i>gyrud</i> for <i>gyur</i> . |
| ab) | L: omits <i>pa</i> . | ac) | F: //. |
| ad) | S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | | |

IV.2

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| a) | F: <i>phyig</i> ? | b) | M: omits /. F: // |
| c) | S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . F: <i>bsnung</i> ? | d) | J: <i>pa</i> for <i>par</i> . |
| e) | F: <i>gsung</i> . | f) | J: <i>byad</i> for <i>byung</i> . |
| g) | F: // for /. L: omits /. | h) | F: //. |
| i) | B: <i>spang</i> for <i>spong</i> . | j) | M: <i>pa'i</i> . |
| k) | A: <i>'byord</i> for <i>'byor</i> . | l) | F: //. |
| m) | L: <i>bstan</i> for <i>stan</i> . | n) | B: inserts /. |
| o) | F: <i>nams</i> . | p) | F: //. |
| q) | L: omits <i>ni</i> . | r) | F: //. |
| s) | N: <i>yongsu</i> . | | |
| t) | F: //. L: omits <i>kha cig ni 'isho ba yongs su dag pa</i> /. | v) | F: omits <i>ba</i> . |
| u) | F: //. | x) | F: omits <i>ni</i> . |
| w) | F: //. | z) | F: omits <i>ni</i> . |
| y) | A: <i>'dzind</i> for <i>'dzin</i> . | ab) | F: // for /. J: omits /. |
| aa) | A: <i>'dzind</i> for <i>'dzin</i> . | ad) | F: <i>brdal</i> . |
| ac) | F: omits <i>kha cig ni</i> . | af) | A: <i>'khord</i> for <i>'khor</i> . |
| ae) | A: <i>'khord</i> for <i>'khor</i> . | ah) | A: <i>stond</i> for <i>ston</i> . |
| ag) | F: <i>dang</i> . | aj) | M: <i>seinn</i> . |
| ai) | F: //. | ak) | D: <i>srung</i> for <i>bsrung</i> . S: <i>bsrungs</i> for <i>bsrung</i> . F: inserts <i>ba'i</i> . L: inserts <i>ba</i> . |
| al) | S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | am) | M: inserts /. |
| an) | Śikṣ P: omits <i>gi</i> . | ao) | A: / for //. |

IV.3

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|--|
| a) | F: <i>pas</i> . | b) | F: <i>bsgo</i> . |
| c) | A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | d) | A: <i>byas te</i> for <i>bya ste</i> . F: <i>te</i> for <i>ste</i> . |
| e) | F: //. | f) | A: <i>gso</i> for <i>gsol</i> . |
| g) | F: <i>bya'o</i> . | h) | F: //. |
| i) | A: <i>tus</i> for <i>dus</i> . | j) | M: <i>par</i> . |
| k) | A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | l) | S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| m) | A: <i>gald</i> for <i>gal</i> . F: <i>ga la</i> for <i>gal</i> . | n) | A: omits <i>dge slong</i> . |
| o) | F: <i>mgon</i> . | p) | D <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . S: omits <i>pa</i> . |
| q) | F: omits <i>bya</i> . | r) | F: <i>bye</i> . |
| s) | M: omits <i>las</i> . | t) | L: <i>dag</i> for <i>bdag</i> . |
| u) | A: / for //. | v) | P: <i>bskes</i> . Śikṣ P: inserts <i>pa</i> . |
| w) | A: <i>dag bsgos pa</i> for <i>zhig bskos la</i> . | x) | F: <i>gzhugs te</i> for <i>gzhug ste</i> . |
| y) | F: <i>mgon</i> . | z) | F: <i>pa la</i> . |
| aa) | A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | ab) | A: / for //. |

IV.4

- a) M: *bash* (or *bsha*).

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|---------------------------------------|
| b) | A: 'byord for 'byor. F: ya-btags added in another hand. | d) | F: te. |
| c) | M: ba for pa. | f) | A: 'byord for 'byor. |
| e) | Śikṣ D: omits /. | h) | A: myi for mi. |
| g) | A: myi for mi. | j) | L: gzhugo. |
| i) | F: gzhugs. | l) | A: omits spyod. |
| k) | A: 'byord for 'byor. | n) | B: 'ang for dang. |
| m) | S: cha'ang. | p) | A: 'byord for 'byor. |
| o) | F: ger. | r) | B: pa for ba. F: bcas pa for bca' ba. |
| q) | F: gza'. | t) | A: bstand for bstan. |
| s) | A: sbyind for sbyin. | v) | M: thamd. |
| u) | P: ta (broken?). | x) | A: / for //. |
| w) | F: inserts //. | | |

IV.5

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|--|
| a) | S: srungs for srung. | b) | F: btson. |
| c) | L: ba for pa. | d) | F: te. |
| e) | A: thon for ton. F: ston for ton. | f) | N: space of ten letters. |
| g) | F: 'gro. | h) | F: //. |
| i) | F: ltar. | j) | L: space of one erased letter after lta. |
| k) | A: ltar for lta bur. F: bu for bur. | l) | A: gyrod for gyur. |
| m) | F: ba for pa. | n) | J: omits lta. |
| o) | M: bar. | p) | A: ba for bar. |
| q) | N: space of three letters. | r) | F: sbro. |
| s) | S: srungs for srung. F: bsrung. | t) | A: inserts du. |
| u) | A: bar for par. F: pa for par. | v) | F: btad. |
| w) | F: par. | x) | A: myi for mi. |
| y) | F: bya'o. | z) | F: //. |
| aa) | F: ba. | ab) | A: myi for mi. |
| ac) | A: / for //. | ad) | F: te. |
| ae) | A: -ge slong ma- torn off, but fairly certain. | | |

IV.6

- | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|-----|--|
| a) | S: srungs for srung. | b) | F: inserts /, end of line. |
| c) | A: bas for pas. | d) | A: myi for mi. |
| e) | Śikṣ P: / for //. | f) | F: omits /. |
| g) | F: bsdal. | h) | A: 'khord for 'khor. |
| i) | A: 'khord for 'khor. | j) | P: written with space between ju and ga. |
| k) | S: inserts /. | l) | F: inserts /, end of folio. |
| m) | F: zhug. | n) | M: gzhugo. |
| o) | A: nyand for nyan. | p) | A: 'khord for 'khor. |
| q) | F: kyi. | r) | A: 'khord for 'khor. |
| s) | M: rnamr. | t) | Śikṣ D: gyis for gyi. |
| u) | A: 'khord for 'khor. | v) | A: tu for du. |
| w) | F: bzhugs. | x) | F: omits la dge slong. |
| y) | F: par. | z) | N: deg for de dag. |
| aa) | F: omits de dag dge slong. | ab) | A: da for ta. |
| ac) | B: bsrung for bsu. | | |

IV.7

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) A: 'dzind for 'dzin. |
| c) S: omits /. F: //. | d) A: 'dzind for 'dzin. |
| e) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . | f) F: inserts <i>la</i> . |
| g) L: one letter erased here. | h) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . |
| i) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | j) F: <i>te</i> . |
| k) P: <i>sa</i> of <i>kyis</i> and <i>zhal ta bya</i> written in space of three letters. | |
| l) A: 'dzind for 'dzin. D: Re-written in Karmapa re-print, and the same re-writing in the Berkeley Dharma Publishing edition proves the latter is a mere copy of the former. | |
| m) S: omits /. | n) A: 'dzind for 'dzin. |
| o) M: <i>pa'i</i> for <i>pa de'i</i> . | p) J: // for /. |
| q) A: <i>bstand</i> for <i>bstan</i> . | r) F: <i>par</i> . |

IV.8

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) F: <i>te</i> . | b) F: <i>pa</i> . |
| c) A: 'dzind for 'dzin. | d) S: omits /. F: //. |
| e) A: 'dzind for 'dzin. | f) S: 'phangs. |
| g) A: / for //. | h) A: <i>gyis</i> for <i>gyi</i> . |
| i) F: <i>dag</i> . | j) F: <i>de</i> for <i>ta</i> . |
| k) F: inserts <i>su</i> . | l) N: 'bul for <i>dbul</i> . |
| m) F: <i>bya'o</i> . | n) F: //. |
| o) A: <i>la</i> for <i>gyi</i> . | p) F: <i>snyed</i> . |
| q) A: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . N: one letter space after <i>pa</i> . | |
| r) B: <i>bstsags</i> for <i>bsags</i> . F: <i>brtag</i> for <i>bsags</i> . P: probably corrected. | |
| s) B: <i>sba</i> for <i>sba</i> . | t) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| u) A: inserts <i>ba</i> . | v) F: //. |
| w) A: omits /. | x) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . F: <i>byed</i> for <i>med</i> . |
| y) F: <i>bye'o</i> . | z) L: <i>bdun</i> for 'dun. |
| aa) F: <i>zheng</i> . | ab) F: 'jig. |
| ac) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | ad) A: / for //. |

IV.9

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) A: <i>rtond</i> for <i>rton</i> . | b) F: <i>bya'o</i> . |
| c) F: //. | d) F: <i>khyims</i> . |
| e) A: <i>rtond</i> for <i>rton</i> . L: <i>ston</i> for <i>rton</i> . | |
| f) A: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . F: at beginning of folio repeats: <i>bya'o // khyims pa'i phyogs la rton par</i> . | |
| g) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | h) A: / for //. |
| i) F: <i>gyis</i> . | j) A: <i>rtond</i> for <i>rton</i> . L: <i>ston</i> for <i>rton</i> . |
| k) A: <i>bya ba'i</i> for <i>bya'i</i> . | l) A: omits /. |
| m) A: <i>rtond</i> for <i>rton</i> . L: <i>ston</i> for <i>rton</i> . | n) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| o) S: <i>la'ang</i> . | p) A: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . |
| q) A: <i>myi'i</i> for <i>mi</i> . | r) A: omits <i>bya'i</i> . F: <i>bya'o</i> for <i>bya'i</i> . |
| s) F: // for /. Śikṣ D: <i>bya'o // for bya'i</i> /. | t) M: <i>ba yang</i> , S: <i>ba'ang</i> for <i>pa yang</i> . |
| u) F: <i>gyis</i> . | v) Śikṣ P: <i>zhang</i> for <i>zhing</i> . S: inserts /. |
| w) F: some space between <i>dga</i> and <i>ra</i> . | x) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |

IV.10

- a) F: *gyis*.
 c) F: //.
 e) A: *ji* for *ci*.
 g) F: *gzhan*.
 i) F: //.
 k) F: *par*.
 m) F: *snyed*.
 o) F: inserts *po*.
 q) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 s) A: 'jig for *mchod*.
 u) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 w) F: 'brel.
 x) S: 'phongs for *phongs*. F: *phung* for *phong*.
 y) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*. F: inserts *nga*.
 aa) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*. F: inserts *ta*.
 ab) F: It is hard to say what was intended. Probably *skong* was written, then corrected, so perhaps *slong* was intended after all.
 ac) Śikṣ P: *gis* for *gi*.
 b) A: omits /. F: // for /.
 d) F: omits *gyi*.
 f) S: *ci'ang*.
 h) A: *byas te* for *bya ste*.
 j) M: omits *dang*.
 l) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 n) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 p) P: *ten*.
 r) A: / for //.
 t) S: *pa'ang*.
 v) Śikṣ P: omits *la*.
 z) F: inserts *med*.
 ad) A: *bar* for *par*.

IV.11

- a) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*.
 c) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*.
 e) M: *tham*.
 g) B: *pa* for *pa'i*.
 i) F: //.
 k) F: omits *pa ni che*.
 m) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*.
 o) A: *gald* for *gal*.
 q) A: *myed* for *med*.
 s) F: *snyed*.
 u) L: *de* for 'di.
 w) A: *bar* for *par*.
 y) A: / for //.
 aa) F: *dam*.
 ac) L: *pa* for *ba*.
 ae) J: / for //.
 b) P: [end of line]: *bzhi' dag* for *bzhi'i dge*.
 d) F: *gyi*.
 f) F: //.
 h) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*.
 j) F: *snyed*.
 l) F: *par*. M: one space after *bar*.
 n) F: //.
 p) A: inserts *la*.
 r) F: omits *dang*.
 t) F: *de*.
 v) L: *bya* for *bya'o*.
 x) D *gyi*.
 z) L: *pas* for *pa*.
 ab) B: omits *la*.
 ad) F: omits *gshegs*.

IV.12

- a) F: *ci*.
 c) A: *zind* for *zin*.
 e) F: //.
 g) Śikṣ P: *gi* for *gis*. M: inserts /.
 i) F: omits *kyi*.
 k) Śikṣ P: omits *gyi*.
 m) B: *che da* for *cher* (clear because *che* at end of one line, *da* at beginning of next) F: *che* for *cher*.
 n) F: writes *pa* below the line.
 p) Śikṣ P: omits *kyang*.
 (b) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*. F: inserts *na*.
 d) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 f) B: *dad pa* for *dang ba*.
 h) S: inserts / F: //.
 j) A: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
 l) F: *no*.
 o) F: dmos.
 q) P: one space after *ci*.

- | | |
|--|--|
| r) A: <i>gus pa</i> for <i>gos</i> . | s) S: inserts /. |
| t) A: <i>chard</i> for <i>char</i> . | u) B: <i>dngos</i> for <i>dengs</i> . D: <i>dongs</i> for <i>dengs</i> . |
| v) P: <i>ma dang char pas dengs kyang</i> cramped into a space of about eight letters. | |
| w) F: <i>dbyigs</i> . | x) F: <i>tu</i> . |
| y) L: <i>bskur</i> for <i>bsgyur</i> . | z) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| aa) J: /for //. | ab) M: omits <i>kyang</i> . F: inserts //. |
| ac) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | ad) L: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| ae) A: <i>brel par myed ba'i</i> for <i>brel ba med pa'i</i> . | af) F: <i>mya</i> written, corrected to <i>phy</i> . |
| ag) N: omits <i>ro</i> . P: <i>ra</i> for <i>ro</i> (broken?). | |

IV.13

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) F: omits <i>ltar</i> . |
| c) F: <i>te</i> for <i>ste</i> . L: <i>byas te</i> for <i>bya ste</i> . | d) A: omits /. F: // for /. |
| e) F: <i>de</i> . | |
| f) B: <i>chos</i> for <i>chog</i> . J: obscure, but one letter after <i>chog</i> erased or illegible. | |
| g) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | h) A: / for //. |

IV.14

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) F: <i>pas</i> . | b) M: <i>snang</i> . |
| c) B: omits <i>dang</i> . P: <i>dang</i> written small. | d) L: omits <i>rnams</i> . |
| e) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | f) M: <i>semin</i> . |
| g) F: omits <i>'gro bar</i> . | h) A: <i>myi'</i> for <i>mi'i</i> . F: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi'i</i> . |
| i) B: omits <i>yang</i> (See next). S: <i>na'ang</i> for <i>na yang</i> . | |
| j) F: <i>drang</i> . P: <i>yang bran dang</i> written small in space of four letters. S: inserts /. | |
| k) N: <i>lcags</i> for <i>lcag</i> . | l) F: <i>cag</i> . |
| m) A: <i>'phrad</i> for <i>phrad</i> . | |

IV.15

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) F: inserts <i>la</i> , and cancels it. |
| c) L: <i>las</i> for <i>bya ba</i> . | d) F: <i>gar</i> . |
| e) F: <i>'jig</i> . | f) F: <i>sdig ba</i> for <i>sdigs pa</i> . |
| g) M: <i>bar</i> . | h) B: <i>mdag</i> for <i>mngag</i> . |
| i) Śikṣ D: omits /. | j) F: omits <i>de</i> . |
| k) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | l) M: <i>semin</i> . |
| m) F: <i>phul</i> . | |
| n) F: <i>ba'</i> . There may be a <i>gi-gu</i> erased above '. | o) F: <i>lcag</i> . |
| p) F: omits <i>cing</i> . | q) F: omits <i>'bar / rab tu 'bar la / kun tu</i> . |
| r) F: omits <i>bar</i> . | |

IV.16

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) F: <i>nas</i> for <i>gnas</i> . | b) F: <i>sdig</i> . S: <i>bsdigs</i> . |
| c) F: <i>dag gis</i> for <i>ngag gi</i> . | d) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . |
| e) F: <i>brgyur ba</i> for <i>gyur pa</i> . | f) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| g) F: <i>lce</i> . | h) L: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . |
| i) F: <i>de</i> . | j) Śikṣ P: one letter space. |
| k) F: omits <i>de</i> . | l) J: <i>phar</i> for <i>phur?</i> N: <i>pur</i> for <i>phur?</i> |

- | | |
|--|--|
| m) P: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . | n) S: insert /. |
| o) F: <i>bar</i> for <i>rab</i> . | p) A: <i>kund</i> for <i>kun</i> . |
| q) A: <i>myer</i> for <i>mer</i> . P: <i>mar</i> for <i>mer</i> . F: <i>med</i> for <i>mer</i> . | |
| r) M: 'gyuro. F: <i>te</i> for <i>ro</i> . | s) F: //. |
| t) B: <i>nges</i> for <i>des</i> . | u) F: <i>bsdig</i> for <i>bsdigs</i> . L: <i>sdigs</i> for <i>bsdigs</i> . |
| v) N: inserts /. | w) F: inserts <i>gi</i> . |
| x) B: ' <i>dug</i> for <i>gdug</i> . P: corrected to <i>gdug</i> . | y) A: <i>smra bar gyurd</i> for <i>smras par gyur</i> . |
| z) M: <i>phyiro</i> . | |

IV.17

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) F: <i>la</i> . | b) F: <i>snyed</i> . |
| c) F: ' <i>du</i> . | d) J: <i>te</i> for <i>ste</i> . |
| e) L: <i>dusu</i> . | f) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| g) M: <i>byin</i> . | h) L: <i>btsam</i> for <i>btsams</i> . |
| i) F: <i>tses</i> . | j) A: <i>sdig</i> for <i>sbyin</i> . |
| k) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | l) F: <i>sbyin</i> . |
| m) F: <i>bcig</i> . | n) F: <i>na</i> . |
| o) Śikṣ P: omits <i>ma</i> . | p) N: omits <i>na</i> . |
| q) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . N: <i>da ma</i> for <i>de mi</i> ? | r) F: <i>yid</i> . |
| s) L: <i>dwags</i> for <i>dags</i> . | t) Śikṣ P: ' <i>byin</i> for ' <i>jim</i> . |
| u) Śikṣ D: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | v) D <i>cis</i> . |
| w) F: <i>dag</i> . | x) F, Śikṣ P: <i>gyi</i> for <i>gyis</i> . |
| y) N: <i>slang</i> for <i>blangs</i> . | z) F: <i>brtan</i> . |
| aa) A: omits / . F: // for /. | |
| ab) A: <i>bstand</i> for <i>bstan</i> . Śikṣ P: omits <i>de bstan</i> . | ac) A: <i>myig</i> for <i>mig</i> . |
| ad) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | |
| ae) D, Śikṣ P: ' <i>dzum</i> for ' <i>dzums</i> . F: ' <i>dzug</i> for ' <i>dzums</i> . | |
| af) F: <i>te</i> . | |
| ag) D: <i>sa</i> of <i>zas</i> and <i>de la</i> written small, perhaps corrected. J: omits <i>la</i> . | |
| ah) A: <i>nyend</i> for <i>nyen</i> . M: <i>nyan</i> for <i>nyen</i> . | ai) N: omits <i>gyi</i> . |
| aj) S: <i>du'ang</i> , for <i>du yang</i> , and inserts <i>kha</i> . Śikṣ P: omits <i>yang</i> . | |
| ak) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | al) L: <i>lte rgya lam</i> for <i>ste brgya la</i> . |
| am) F: <i>skyug</i> for <i>skyugs</i> . L: <i>sgyugs</i> for <i>skyugs</i> . | an) F: <i>de</i> for <i>des</i> . N: <i>das</i> for <i>des</i> . |
| ao) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | ap) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . F: ' <i>gyur</i> for <i>gyur</i> . |
| aq) M: <i>phyiro</i> . | ar) A: / for //. |

IV.18

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| a) L: inserts /. | b) F: //. |
| c) F: <i>bzhi</i> . | d) J: omits <i>gyi</i> . |
| e) F: //. | f) F: omits <i>rten</i> . |
| g) L: <i>nas</i> for <i>na</i> . | h) M: <i>rnamr</i> . |
| i) A: <i>smyind</i> for <i>smin</i> . | j) A: <i>bskald</i> for <i>bskal</i> . |
| k) S: <i>par</i> . | l) F: omits <i>pas</i> . |
| m) N: <i>kyi</i> for <i>kyis</i> . | n) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| o) L: <i>lango</i> . | |

IV.19

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) F: <i>te</i> . |
| c) F: omits <i>la</i> . | d) N: inserts /. |
| e) L: emits /. | f) F: <i>sem</i> . |
| g) B: space of one letter. | h) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| i) L: <i>rungo</i> . A: inserts /. N: inserts //. | j) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| k) L: one letter erased. | l) S: inserts /. |
| m) M: <i>yongsu</i> . | n) A: / for //. |
| o) A: / for //. | |

IV.20

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | |
| b) A: <i>par</i> for <i>pa</i> . F: <i>te byad pas</i> for <i>ta byed pa</i> . | c) F: omits <i>la</i> . |
| d) S: <i>za'ang</i> . | e) F: //. |
| f) A: <i>byind kyis</i> for <i>byin gyis</i> . N: omits <i>byin gyis</i> . | |
| g) F: <i>zed</i> . | h) F: omits /. |
| i) F: //. | j) A: omits <i>bsod snyoms sam</i> /. F: // for /. |
| k) F: <i>rnam</i> . | l) F: //. |
| m) S: <i>pa</i> . | n) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |

IV.21

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) M: <i>bcomds</i> . | b) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| c) A: <i>gsold</i> for <i>gsol</i> . | d) F: <i>te</i> . |
| e) A: <i>kyis</i> for <i>kyi</i> . | f) A: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . |
| g) F: //. | h) F: <i>rnam</i> for <i>rnams</i> . |
| i) A: <i>stsald</i> for <i>stsal</i> . | |
| j) B: <i>te</i> for <i>ta</i> . In other places it appears (IV.18 etc.) <i>te</i> was written and the vowel sign effaced. | |

V.1

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) F: omits //. | b) M: <i>bcomds</i> . |
| c) F: <i>pa gang</i> written as <i>nggang</i> ; evidently <i>pa</i> miswritten as <i>nga</i> . | |
| d) F: <i>mgon</i> . | |
| e) A: omits <i>gang dag bdag dgon pa pa</i> . F: omits <i>pa</i> . J: repeats <i>gang dag bdag dgon pa pa</i> . | |
| f) F: <i>mchi</i> . | g) F: //, end of line. |
| h) N: <i>cam</i> for <i>tsam</i> . | i) N: space of one letter. |
| j) F: <i>la</i> erased, so the text reads <i>song</i> . | k) P: one space. |
| l) M: one space. | m) A: <i>gsold</i> for <i>gsol</i> . |
| n) S: nine spaces after <i>shad</i> . | o) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| p) A: <i>stsald</i> for <i>stsal</i> . | |

V.2

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . F: 'srung. | b) F: <i>nag</i> . |
| c) F: <i>gyis</i> . | d) F: <i>nas</i> . |
| e) F: <i>nas</i> . | f) A: <i>bcha'</i> for <i>bca'</i> . |
| g) F: <i>phyug</i> . | h) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . |
| i) N: <i>sdigs</i> for <i>sdig</i> . | j) F: <i>phrul</i> . |
| k) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | l) L: <i>dwags</i> for <i>dags</i> . |

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| m) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | n) F: //. |
| o) F: <i>ba'i</i> . | p) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| q) B: <i>pas</i> for <i>bas</i> . F: <i>bsam</i> for <i>bas</i> . | |

V.3

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) L: omits <i>de na gnas</i> . | b) F: <i>brkyad</i> . |
| c) A: omits /, end of line. F: // for /. | d) F: //. |
| e) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | f) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . P: <i>ma</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| g) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | h) P: <i>bar</i> . |
| i) M: <i>thamd</i> . | j) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| k) L: <i>dwags</i> for <i>dags</i> . | l) M: <i>mdzi</i> for ' <i>chi</i> '. N: <i>mchi</i> for ' <i>chi</i> '. |
| m) L: ' <i>chil</i> for ' <i>chi ba</i> . | n) F: <i>par</i> . |
| o) A: one letter erased after <i>bya</i> . | p) F: //. |
| q) L: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . | r) L: omits <i>par</i> . |
| s) F: ' <i>che</i> . | t) N: <i>mtsho'i</i> for ' <i>tsho'i</i> '. S: inserts /. |
| u) N: <i>mtsho</i> for ' <i>tsho</i> . | v) P: <i>ba</i> written small; added? |
| w) F: omits <i>dang</i> . S: inserts /. | x) F: <i>chos</i> for ' <i>tsho</i> '. |
| y) F: <i>po'i</i> . | z) F: <i>gnas</i> . |

V.4

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| a) M: <i>seinn</i> . | b) M: <i>thamd</i> . |
| c) B: <i>pa skyed</i> for <i>bskyed</i> . | d) F: //. |
| e) F: //, end of line. | f) M: <i>ba'i</i> . |
| g) F: //. | h) F: //. |
| i) F: //. | j) F: <i>ngas</i> . |
| k) F: <i>dpa'i</i> . | l) F: //. |
| m) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | n) F: //. |
| o) L: one letter erased at beginning of line. | |

V.5

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) F: omits <i>pa</i> . | b) F: //. |
| c) Śikṣ P: inserts /. | d) F: <i>par</i> . |
| e) F: //. | |
| f) F: <i>leges</i> (vowel written over both <i>la</i> and <i>ga</i>). | g) L: one letter space between <i>bya</i> and <i>sa</i> . |
| h) F: omits ' <i>am</i> . | i) F: inserts //. |
| j) F: <i>grog</i> . | k) Śikṣ D: omits <i>dag</i> . |
| l) Śikṣ P: omits <i>bdag</i> . | m) F: inserts <i>dag</i> . |
| n) L: omits <i>gnas na</i> . | o) Śikṣ D: <i>sams</i> for <i>sems</i> . |

V.6

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) F: <i>gnas</i> . | b) F: ' <i>ong</i> . |
| c) F: inserts /. | d) F: <i>bu</i> . |
| e) B: inserts <i>bdag</i> . | f) Śikṣ P: <i>mad</i> for <i>med</i> . |
| g) F: omits <i>la</i> . | h) F: // for /, N: omits /, and four spaces. |
| i) M: <i>rnainr</i> . | |
| j) N: <i>rtogs</i> for <i>rtog</i> . L: one letter erased after <i>rtog</i> . | k) M: <i>rnainr</i> . |

- | | |
|--|--|
| l) F: omits <i>pas rnam par rtog</i> . | m) M: <i>rnamr</i> . |
| n) F: <i>pa</i> . | o) M: <i>rnamr</i> . |
| p) Śikṣ D: <i>rteg</i> for <i>rtog</i> ? | |
| q) B: ' <i>tsho pa'i</i> ' for ' <i>tshe ba'i</i> '. J: ' <i>tshe ba'i</i> ' very cramped. | |
| r) M: <i>rnamr</i> . | s) F: omits <i>pas rnam par rtog</i> . |
| t) Śikṣ D: <i>gang</i> for <i>bdag</i> . | u) F: <i>las</i> . |
| v) Śikṣ D: <i>dda'</i> for <i>dga'</i> . | w) M, Śikṣ P: insert /. F: //. |
| x) F, Śikṣ P: <i>gi</i> for <i>gis</i> . | |
| y) B: <i>ma myes</i> for <i>mnyes</i> . M: <i>nyes</i> for <i>mnyes</i> . N: <i>ma</i> added below line. | |
| z) F: <i>lta</i> . | aa) F: //. |
| ab) M: <i>bcomids</i> . | ac) F: inserts <i>ro</i> /. |
| ad) N: inserts //. | |

V.7

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| a) F: <i>sdon</i> . | b) M: <i>bas</i> . |
| c) L: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . | d) F: //. |
| e) F: <i>phu ngol</i> for <i>phung</i> . | f) M: //. |
| g) N: omits <i>dang</i> . | |
| h) F: omits <i>tshul 'chos pa med pa dang / kha gsag med pa dang / 'tsho ba yongs su dag pa dang /</i> . | |
| i) L: <i>tinge</i> . | j) P: <i>kyi</i> . |
| k) L: one or two letters erased. | l) F: omits <i>thos pa'i</i> . |
| m) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | n) B: omits <i>ba</i> . |
| o) P: from <i>la rten pa dang</i> in (8) to ' <i>dod</i> ' here is cramped and the whole section has evidently been corrected. | |
| p) F: <i>las</i> . | q) F: <i>ngos</i> . |
| r) B: <i>par</i> for <i>bar</i> . | s) F: //. |
| t) F: <i>zhi</i> . | u) F: omits <i>ltar</i> . |
| v) F: //. | |
| w) F: //. Then, six or seven letters erased at the beginning of a line, plus <i>pa dang /</i> , and then (16) <i>rtag pa</i> and so on begins. | |
| x) F: <i>pa</i> . | y) L: <i>yongsu</i> . |
| z) M: <i>seinn</i> . | aa) B: space of one letter. |
| ab) F: omits <i>rnam par</i> . | ac) S: <i>pa'i</i> . |
| ad) F: <i>smod ba'i</i> for <i>smon pa</i> . | ae) L: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| af) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | ag) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| ah) F: <i>ci</i> . | ai) F: //. P: eight spaces after /. |
| aj) F: omits <i>sems kyi</i> . | ak) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| al) P: nine spaces. | am) L: <i>yongsu</i> . |
| an) F: omits <i>la</i> . | ao) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| ap) F: //. | aq) F: //. |
| ar) M: one space. | as) F: <i>gsum</i> . |
| at) F: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | au) F: <i>sgom</i> . |
| av) M: <i>ba'i</i> . | aw) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| ax) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | ay) F: omits <i>bral ba dang /</i> . |
| az) F: <i>tu</i> . | ba) F: <i>phyigs</i> . |
| bb) F: //. | bc) J: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . |
| bd) F: the handwriting changes dramatically here, and looks like it is written by a child (!?). | |
| be) F: <i>tu</i> . | |
| bf) F: <i>gyurd</i> written, and the <i>da</i> appears to perhaps be cancelled? | |

- bg) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 bh) B: omits /. P: end of line, impossible to tell whether / is present.
 bi) F: omits *bdun la*.
 bj) F: 'a-chung written with a short stroke which looks like the apostrophe (').
 bk) M: *bar*. bl) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 bm) M: *ba* for *pa*.

V.8

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*. b) L: *stong* for *stod*.
 c) F: omits /. d) F: omits *nam gyi cha*.
 e) F: *gyi* for *la*. f) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 g) F: *bar*. h) F: *ba'i*.
 i) F: omits *de na gnas*.

V.9

- a) L: *bar* for *par*. b) F: *bar*.
 c) F: *myi*. d) S: *cha*.
 e) M: *ba* for *pa*. f) N: space of six letters.
 g) F: *myi*.
 h) J: /for //. F: the handwriting returns to a normal clear hand here.
 i) F: *brtsom* written, and then *ma* corrected to *na*.
 j) M: *bar*. k) S: *bskams*. F: *bskal*.
 l) F: 'written below line. L: 'chag *sa* for 'chags. N: *chags* for 'chags.
 m) N: 'dugs *pa* for 'dug *sar*? n) F: *gyis*.
 o) N: omits /. p) J: /for //.

V.10

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*. b) N: omits *pa*, with space.
 c) B: *pa* for *ba*. d) M: *ba'i*.
 e) S: inserts /. f) F: *brdal*.
 g) F: *nams*. h) F: *kyis*.
 i) B: *mi* for *yi*. j) M: 'written here and erased. F: *bya'o*.
 k) F: //.
 l) L: omits *yongs su yi chad par mi bya / rnyed kyang* (haplography).
 m) M: *rnamr*. n) F: *soms* for *nams*. L: *snayoms* for *nams*.
 o) S: inserts /. p) B: omits *grong*.
 q) F: *brdal*. r) S: *nams*.

V.11

- a) F: *brdal*. b) F: *gos*.
 c) P: one space. d) F: *kyis*.
 e) N: omits *na*. f) Śikṣ D: inserts *mi*.
 g) J: *du* for *tu*. h) F: *brdams*.
 i) F: *gnya*. j) F: inserts *gyis*.
 k) F: *gi*. l) J: /for //.
 m) L: *blangs* for *blang*. n) P: *bya'o // gang nas ma* cramped.

- | | |
|---|--|
| o) F: omits <i>yang</i> . | p) Śikṣ P: <i>pha</i> for <i>pa</i> (? dirt?). |
| q) P: from <i>bslangs pa las</i> / until <i>rnyed</i> very cramped. | r) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| s) F: omits <i>dag</i> . | t) F: <i>par</i> . |
| u) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | v) L: omits <i>bdag</i> . |
| w) S: <i>pa'ang</i> . | x) A: <i>mtshard</i> for <i>mtshar</i> . |
| y) B: <i>ci</i> for <i>ci</i> . P: one space after <i>ci</i> . | z) D <i>snyom</i> . |
| aa) A: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . | ab) A: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . |
| ac) M: <i>mi</i> . | ad) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . |

V.12

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| a) A: <i>myig</i> for <i>mig</i> . | b) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . N: 'gyur for <i>gyur</i> . |
| c) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | d) F: 'gro. |
| e) F: <i>skyes</i> . | f) Śikṣ P: 'ong for <i>song</i> . |
| g) S: <i>la'ang</i> . | h) F: <i>rjes</i> . |
| i) M: <i>seinn</i> . | j) A: <i>myig</i> for <i>mig</i> . |
| k) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . | l) A: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| m) F: <i>tho</i> . | n) L: <i>risu</i> . |
| o) Śikṣ P: omits //. | |

V.13

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) B: 'am for <i>ram</i> . | b) F: <i>ni</i> . |
| c) M: <i>seinn</i> . | d) A: <i>kund</i> for <i>kun</i> . |
| e) Śikṣ D: <i>la</i> for <i>las</i> . | f) M: <i>seinn</i> . |
| g) F: <i>de'i</i> . | h) Śikṣ P: omits <i>bdag</i> . |
| i) A: <i>myig</i> for <i>mig</i> . | j) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . F: 'gyur for <i>gyur</i> . |
| k) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | l) Śikṣ D: <i>pa'i</i> for <i>ba'i</i> . |
| m) M: <i>seinn</i> . | n) F: inserts /. |
| o) Śikṣ P: <i>pa</i> for <i>nas</i> . | p) A: <i>lend</i> for <i>len</i> . |
| q) N: omits /. | r) Śikṣ P: <i>de</i> for <i>des</i> . |
| s) N: space of one letter. | t) F: omits <i>de</i> . |
| u) A: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . | v) A: <i>spyad</i> for <i>spyod</i> . |
| w) L: inserts <i>dang / cho dang ldan pa'i spyod pa</i> . | x) A: <i>byind kyis</i> for <i>byin gyis</i> . |
| y) N: <i>rlabs</i> for <i>brlabs</i> . | |
| z) F: <i>das</i> ? Or e vowel very faint? N: <i>de</i> for <i>des</i> . | |
| aa) F: <i>dkrungs</i> for <i>krung</i> . J: <i>dkrung</i> for <i>krung</i> . N: <i>krungs</i> for <i>krung</i> . | |
| ab) F: omits <i>bsod snyoms de</i> . | ac) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . |
| ad) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | ae) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| af) F: <i>rkam</i> . | ag) A: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| ah) A: <i>zhend</i> for <i>zhen</i> . L: <i>zhes</i> for <i>zhen</i> . | ai) F: inserts 'di. |
| aj) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . | ak) B: <i>zang</i> for <i>zing</i> . |
| al) F: <i>bsdus</i> . | am) F: <i>par</i> . |
| an) F: inserts //. | ao) F: inserts <i>bskyed par</i> . |
| ap) N: <i>do</i> for <i>par bya'o</i> . | |

V.14

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| a) F: <i>soms</i> . | b) A: <i>ngand</i> for <i>ngan</i> . |
| c) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . | d) N: <i>de</i> for <i>des</i> . |

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| e) Śikṣ D: <i>bas</i> for <i>pas</i> . | f) F: <i>gis</i> . |
| g) B: <i>par</i> for <i>bar</i> . Śikṣ P: <i>dag par</i> for <i>bar</i> . | h) F: <i>gyur</i> . |
| i) Śikṣ P: omits /. | j) N: <i>bas</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| k) A: omits <i>spong ba bzod par 'gyur</i> /. Śikṣ P: omits /. | m) D: // for /. Śikṣ P: omits /. |
| l) F: inserts <i>dag</i> . | o) Śikṣ P: omits /. |
| n) N: <i>byung</i> for <i>byin</i> . | q) B: // for /. |
| p) F: <i>par</i> . | s) N: omits <i>la</i> . |
| r) M: inserts /. | u) N: omits <i>nas</i> . |
| t) F: <i>kyi</i> . | w) P: two spaces after ' <i>di</i> . |
| v) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | |

V.15

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) F: <i>de</i> . | b) Śikṣ P: inserts /. |
| c) S: <i>la'ang</i> for <i>la yang</i> . N: <i>lang</i> for <i>la yang</i> . | d) A: <i>rand</i> for <i>ran</i> . |
| e) N: <i>pa</i> for <i>par</i> . Śikṣ D: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . | f) A: / for //. |
| g) A: <i>gton</i> for <i>dor</i> . | h) B: omits <i>du yang</i> . S: <i>du'ang</i> for <i>du yang</i> . |
| i) P: <i>yang bya ste bsod</i> very small, in a three letter space. | k) B: <i>sting</i> for <i>steng</i> . P: vowel obscured. |
| j) F: omits <i>las</i> . | m) S: omits //, end of line. |
| l) A: <i>lend</i> for <i>len</i> . | |

V.16

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) M: inserts /. | b) L: <i>dkrus</i> for <i>bkrus</i> . |
| c) A: <i>brtend</i> for <i>brten</i> . F: <i>rten</i> for <i>brten</i> . | d) A: / for //. |
| e) L: omits <i>de</i> . | f) A: <i>myi 'dor</i> for <i>mi dor</i> . N: ' <i>dor</i> for <i>dor</i> . |
| g) A: / for //. | |

V.17

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) S: <i>dgen</i> , end of line. | b) A: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| c) L: written <i>bo'i</i> for space reasons. | d) Śikṣ P: inserts <i>sdig</i> . |
| e) L: <i>sprul</i> for <i>sbrul</i> . | f) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| g) Śikṣ P: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . | h) L: <i>gnasu</i> . |
| i) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | j) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| k) A: <i>ba'i</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . | l) M: <i>namr</i> . |
| m) F: <i>par</i> . | n) A: inserts /. L: inserts //. |
| o) L: <i>sprul</i> for <i>sbrul</i> . | p) A: inserts /. P: two spaces. |
| q) Śikṣ P: <i>gi</i> for <i>gis</i> . | r) M: inserts /. |
| s) Śikṣ P: <i>gi</i> for <i>gis</i> . | u) A: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . |
| t) P: ' <i>di dag la bdag gis zang zing tsam</i> cramped. | w) L: omits /. |
| v) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | y) Śikṣ P: <i>blang bar</i> for <i>blangs par</i> . |
| x) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | aa) F: omits <i>gis</i> . |
| z) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . | ac) B: // for /. F: <i>bya'o</i> // for <i>bya ste</i> /. |
| ab) M: <i>bya</i> for <i>bya'o</i> . A: inserts /. | ae) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| ad) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | ag) A: / for //. |
| af) P: three spaces after <i>gnas</i> . | |

V.18

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| a) N: inserts <i>pa</i> . | b) Śikṣ P: <i>ni</i> for <i>na</i> . F: inserts /. |
| c) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | d) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| e) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | f) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| g) A, J (?): / for //. | |

V.19

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) Śikṣ P: <i>brung</i> (?) for <i>gan</i> . | b) F: omits <i>dge slong</i> . |
| c) A: <i>dgond</i> for <i>dgon</i> . | d) M: <i>ci</i> . |
| e) P: inserts /. | f) Śikṣ P: <i>da</i> for <i>de</i> . |
| g) A: / for //. | h) M: inserts /. |
| i) M: <i>yongsu</i> . | j) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| k) F: ' <i>thebs</i> for <i>thebs</i> . L: <i>theb</i> for <i>thebs</i> . | l) M: <i>ltar</i> . |
| m) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | n) L: <i>bslab</i> for <i>bslabs</i> . |
| o) Śikṣ P: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . | p) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| q) Śikṣ D: omits /. | r) A: <i>bstand</i> for <i>bstan</i> . |
| s) A: inserts <i>ma</i> . | t) Śikṣ P: <i>nod</i> for <i>mnos</i> . |
| u) M: inserts /. | v) B: ' <i>bor</i> for ' <i>bad</i> . |
| w) F: omits <i>ma</i> . | x) F: omits <i>chos</i> . |
| y) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . | z) F: omits <i>pa</i> . |
| aa) M: <i>thamd</i> . | ab) A: / for //. P: omits //. |
| ac) A: <i>nyand</i> for <i>nyan</i> . B: <i>yan</i> for <i>nyan</i> . P: <i>nyin</i> for <i>nyan</i> ? | |
| ad) L: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | ae) A: <i>khyod</i> for <i>khyed</i> . |
| af) P: from <i>bdag ni</i> to <i>gyis</i> very cramped. | ag) A: inserts /. |
| ah) L: <i>bzod</i> for <i>brjod</i> . | ai) Śikṣ D: <i>pa</i> for <i>pas</i> . |

V.20

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | c) N: <i>mgon</i> for <i>dgon</i> . |
| b) A: <i>pang?</i> <i>par?</i> Anyway, something after <i>pa</i> . | e) A: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . |
| d) A: <i>shind</i> for <i>shin</i> . | g) L: <i>nga</i> added cramped. |
| f) M: <i>te</i> . | i) A: <i>myig</i> for <i>mig</i> . |
| h) N: omits /. | k) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . |
| j) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | m) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . |
| l) A: ' <i>dzind</i> for ' <i>dzin</i> . | o) M: <i>señn</i> . |
| n) F: omits <i>la</i> . | q) P: <i>kya</i> . |
| p) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | s) A: <i>rtend</i> for <i>rten</i> . |
| r) P: four spaces after ' <i>di</i> . | u) A: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| t) A: ' <i>brel</i> d for ' <i>brel</i> . F: ' <i>bral</i> for ' <i>brel</i> . | w) B: <i>chogs</i> for <i>tshogs</i> . |
| v) A: <i>rkyend</i> for <i>rkyen</i> . | y) F: <i>cis</i> for <i>ci nas</i> . |
| x) A: <i>ji</i> for <i>ci</i> . | aa) M: <i>thamd</i> . |
| z) A: <i>gyurd</i> for <i>gyur</i> . | ac) A: <i>gyurd pa</i> for ' <i>gyur ba</i> . |
| ab) N: omits <i>zhi bar</i> . | ae) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . |
| ad) P: /. | ag) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . |
| af) A: <i>smond</i> for <i>smon</i> . | |

V.21

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| a) A: <i>la</i> for <i>na</i> . | b) L: omits <i>de na gnas</i> (haplography). |
|---------------------------------|--|

- c) M: inserts *dang*.
 e) A: *bar* for *par*.
 g) A [end of line]: omits /.
 i) A: *rol d kyi* for *rol gyi*.
 k) A: omits /. B: // for /. P: four letter space after *shad*.
 l) F: *gis*.
 n) A: 'dzind for 'dzin.
 p) A: *myed* for *med*.
 r) M: *mede*.
 t) A: inserts /.
 v) S: *ba*.
 x) F: inserts *de*.
 z) L: *gzung ba* for *bzung la*.
 ab) L: *rtsa* for *rtswa*.
 ad) F: *g-yor*.
 af) N: omits /.
 ag) A: 'dzind for 'dzin. P: *lta bu ste / bdag po med pa / bdag gi med pa yongs su 'dzin* very cramped.
 ah) A: *myed* for *med*.
 aj) A: *myed* for *med*. P: *mod* for *med*.
 al) A: *rkyend* for *rkyen*.
 an) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 ap) A: 'gags for 'gag. F: 'gog for 'gag.
 ar) Śikṣ D: *mar* for *ma*.
 at) F: omits *snyam du mtshan ma gzung bar bya'o*.
 d) M: *ci*.
 f) F: 'byung.
 h) M: *ci*.
 j) A: *myed* for *med*.
 m) A: *myed* for *med*.
 o) A: *myed* for *med*.
 q) A: *myed* for *med*.
 s) L: space of one letter.
 u) S: *su'ang*.
 w) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 y) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 aa) S: 'di'ang.
 ac) A: *myig* for *mig*.
 ae) A: omits /.
 ai) A: *myed* for *med*.
 ak) B: omits *pa*.
 am) B: *tshad* for *tshang*.
 ao) D: *bar* for *par*.
 aq) A: *myed* for *med*.
 as) A: *bzung* for *gzung*.
 au) A: / for //.

V.22

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 c) L: one letter space.
 e) M: *sem'd'i*.
 g) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*. F: 'gyur for *gyur*.
 i) A, J (?): / for //.
 k) F: half space between *pa* and *sa*.
 m) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*.
 o) S: *na'ang*.
 q) M: *rnamr*.
 s) S: 'da'o'.
 u) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*.
 w) A: *gyurd* for *gyur*.
 y) A: *gyurd* for 'gyur.
 aa) A [end of line]: omits //.
 ac) A: *myed* for *med*.
 ae) A: *myed* for *med*.
 b) F: *bus*.
 d) M: omits *pa*.
 f) A: / for //.
 h) F: omits *de*.
 j) S: omits *de*.
 l) M: inserts /.
 n) M: inserts /.
 p) N: *la* for *las*.
 r) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 t) A: / for //.
 v) F: omits *par*.
 x) L: omits *de*. N: *de'i* for *de*.
 z) A: *myed* for *med*.
 ab) F: *de'i*.
 ad) M: inserts /.
 af) F: *mtshang*.

V.23

- a) F: *lan* for *len*.
 c) M: *rnamr*.
 e) L: *ba* for *pa'o*.
 b) A: *lend ba myed* for *len pa med*.
 d) F: inserts //, end of line.

VL1

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) J: /for //? P: omits one of the pairs of // between chapters. | c) M: <i>ci</i> . |
| b) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | e) F: <i>rnyoms</i> . |
| d) L: <i>dge slong</i> written in space of about two letters. | g) N: omits /. |
| f) N: inserts <i>ma</i> . | i) A: <i>de</i> for 'di. |
| h) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | k) F: <i>brnyoms</i> . |
| j) B: omits <i>spyod</i> . | m) A: omits <i>la</i> . F: <i>las</i> for <i>la</i> . |
| l) N: omits /. | o) A: inserts /. |
| n) F: <i>ba</i> for <i>la</i> . | q) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| p) F: <i>snyom</i> . | s) F: <i>tshu</i> . |
| r) F: omits <i>dang</i> /. | u) N: <i>bsag</i> for <i>gsag</i> . |
| t) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | w) A: <i>tu</i> for <i>du</i> . |
| v) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | z) M: <i>thamd</i> . |
| x) B: <i>bong</i> for <i>bod</i> . L: <i>bos</i> for <i>bod</i> . N: 'bod for <i>bod</i> . | ab) N: <i>mi</i> for <i>ma</i> . |
| y) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | ad) A: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| aa) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | |
| ac) F: 'bag. | |
| ae) L: <i>bstan</i> for <i>brtan</i> . | |

VL2

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| a) M: <i>thamd</i> . | b) Śikṣ P: <i>kyis</i> for <i>kyi</i> . |
| c) F: omits <i>kyi thams cad</i> . | d) D <i>bar</i> . |
| e) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | f) A: <i>gdold</i> for <i>gdol</i> . Śikṣ P: <i>gdos</i> for <i>gdol</i> . |
| g) F: omits <i>dang</i> . | h) F: <i>btsang</i> . |
| i) F: <i>gtsang</i> . | j) A: omits <i>ni</i> . |
| k) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | l) M: omits <i>cig</i> . |
| m) B: omits <i>cad</i> . | n) A: <i>thams cad</i> for <i>tha mar</i> . |
| o) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | p) M: <i>thuno</i> . F: 'thuno. |
| q) A: / for //. | r) A: / for //. |
| s) L: one letter erased here. | t) A: <i>ltar</i> for <i>lta bas</i> . |
| u) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . | |

VL3

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) M: <i>de de</i> written as <i>dai</i> . | b) N: <i>der</i> for <i>de ltar</i> . |
| c) A: <i>shind</i> for <i>shin</i> . | d) F: <i>shun du</i> for <i>shin tu</i> . J: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . |
| e) A: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . | f) F: <i>rnyoms</i> . |
| g) B: <i>par</i> for <i>bar</i> . | h) F: <i>bya'o //</i> for <i>bya ste /</i> . N: omits /. |
| i) A: <i>las</i> for <i>la</i> . | j) F: <i>rnyom</i> . |
| k) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | l) M: <i>yino</i> . L: inserts /. |
| m) A: omits <i>bud med</i> . | n) F: <i>bsnyod</i> . |
| o) M: <i>pas</i> . | p) M: <i>yino</i> . |
| q) M: <i>yino</i> . | r) M: <i>yino</i> . |
| s) F: <i>gi</i> . | t) A: <i>ngand</i> for <i>ngan</i> . |
| u) M: <i>yino</i> . | v) A: <i>tu</i> for <i>du</i> . |
| w) N: <i>ba</i> for <i>par</i> . | x) F: omits <i>ni</i> . |
| y) M: <i>yino</i> . | z) P: omits /. |
| aa) N: omits <i>ni</i> . | ab) F: omits <i>la</i> . |

- ac) F: 'am for *dang*.
 ae) F: omits /.
 ag) F: 'gyuram.
 ai) N: inserts *pa*.
 aj) B: *sdong* for *sdod*. N: *stoX* (last letter illegible) for *sdod*.
 ak) F: 'gyuram.
 am) J: *du* for *tu*.
 ao) F: 'gyuram.
 ap) B: *bdag* for *bzang*. P: *zang* of *bzang* is a correction.
 aq) Śikṣ P: *po'i* for *po*.
 as) M, Śikṣ D: *ba* for *pa*.
 at) F: omits *rnyed pa*. D: inserts *ni* after *rnyed pa*.
 au) M: *yino*. F: *ni* for *no*. D: has a space of three letters between *no* and *snyam*. J: inserts //.
 av) L: omits *des*.
 ax) M: *tham*d.
 ad) A: *myed* for *med*.
 af) Śikṣ P: *dpar* for *par*.
 ah) Śikṣ D: *ro* // for *ram* /.
 al) A: *shind* for *shin*.
 an) Śikṣ P: *brdogs* for *bsdogs*.
 ar) F: 'gyu.
 aw) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 ay) A: *myi* for *mi*.

VL4

- a) B: *cho ga* for *go cha*. F: *ca* for *cha*. P: corrected.
 b) N: *yid* for *yi*.
 d) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 f) M: *nyido*.
 h) F: *rkam*.
 j) M: *señn*.
 l) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 n) A: *ba* for *pa*.
 p) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 r) B: *don* for *ngon*. P: one space after *ngon*.
 t) F: *ga ga* for *dag*.
 v) S: 'chi for *shi*.
 x) Śikṣ P: omits /.
 z) S: *kya* for *kyl*?
 ab) Śikṣ P: omits /.
 ad) A: / for //.
 c) A: *myi* for *mi*. B: omits *mi*.
 e) N: *bdag* for *pa dag*.
 g) F: /.
 i) L: space between *bya* and *sa*.
 k) A: / for //.
 m) F: *rkam*.
 o) A: *zhend* for *zhen*.
 q) L: *ba* for *pa*.
 s) S: omits *kyang*.
 u) A: 'chi for *shi*.
 w) A: inserts *ro*.
 y) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 aa) N: 'gror for 'gro.
 ac) B: 'dud for *bdud*.

VL5

- a) N: *gi* for *gis*.
 c) D one space after *sems*.
 e) F: *bdud*.
 g) S: *za'ang*.
 i) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 k) A: *gtso* for *gso*. L: *gso* for *gso*.
 m) Śikṣ P: *gi* for *gis*.
 b) Śikṣ D: *zlog* for *bzlog*.
 d) M: inserts /.
 f) B: *yon* for *lon*.
 h) Śikṣ D: 'chad for *chad*.
 j) A: /// (!) for //.
 l) F: *brtsags*.
 n) F: inserts /.

VL6

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 c) J: *ba zed* for *bzed*.
 e) B: *pa'i* for *par*.
 b) J: *ba zed* for *bzed*.
 d) S: *rnyid* for *rnyed*.
 f) A: 'thun for *thun*.

g) L: *mongs* for *mong*.

h) A: /for//.

VL7

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 c) A: inserts *gal te*.
 e) A: *gyrud* for *gyur*. F: 'gyur for *gyur*.
 g) S: inserts /.
 i) F: *de'i* for *des*.
 k) P: bu. S: inserts /.
 m) A: *myed* for *med*.
 o) F: *gis*.
 q) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 s) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 u) B: *di* for *de*.
 w) L: inserts *du*.

- b) A: omits *gal te*.
 d) N: *par* for *pa na bar*.
 f) A: *myed* for *med*.
 h) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 j) A: *myed* for *med*.
 l) M: *gnyisu*.
 n) A: *ba'i* for *ba*. N: *ba'o* for *ba*.
 p) B: omits *bdag ni*.
 r) F: omits *la*.
 t) F: *chos* written above line.
 v) M: *ci*.
 x) A: /for//.

VL8

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 c) F: *ltar* written and changed into *lta ba*.
 e) A: *sbyar* for *sbyor*.
 g) M: *ci*.
 i) F: *bzhi na* for *bzhin*.
 k) F: *rtsi*.
 m) A: *ba'i* for *pa'i*.
 o) B: *nges* for *des*.
 q) F: 'written below line.
 s) F: *gnyisam*.
 u) F: inserts /.
 w) A: 'byord for 'byor.
 y) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 aa) N: *chas* for *chos*.
 ac) F: *phyin?*
 ae) F: inserts *pa*.
 ag) F: *sgyu*.
 ai) J: /for// (?).

- b) M: *ci*.
 d) F: omits *du*. M: inserts /.
 f) F: *pa'o*.
 h) F: omits *ba*.
 j) M: inserts /.
 l) F: *ba* for *la*.
 n) A: 'gyurd for 'gyur.
 p) N: *bad* for *bde*.
 r) F: omits /.
 t) S: inserts /.
 v) A: /for//.
 x) F: *skyed*.
 z) A: 'byord for 'byor.
 ab) F: *glu* for *klu*.
 ad) A: 'byord for 'byor.
 af) F: *kyis*.
 ah) D de.

VL9

- a) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 c) F: *bsgos*.
 e) F: *dpa'*.
 g) L: *dwags* for *dags*. N: *yid btags* for *yi dags*. F: inserts /.
 h) L: *ba* for *pa*. N: omits *pa*.
 i) L: *nye bar* for *nyes par*, and insert *zhi bar*.
 j) B: *la* for *lo*.
 l) B: *kha zas* for *bzar*. M: *gzar* for *bzar*. Śikṣ D: *bza'* for *bzar*.
 m) L: *ba* for *pa*.
 o) N: //for//.
- b) F: *kyis*.
 d) Śikṣ D: *bgo ste* for *bgos te*.
 f) F: omits *zhag*.
 k) N: inserts *tsam yang*.
 n) M: *yode*.
 p) F: omits *du*.

- | | |
|---|---|
| q) S: las. | r) F: omits <i>lus nyam chung ba'am</i> . |
| s) M: inserts /. | t) F: bas. |
| u) F: written as <i>bsgo ma</i> . | |
| v) F: not clear, but the initial letter seems to be something other than '. | |
| w) F: inserts an additional <i>par</i> . | |

VL10

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) F: inserts /. |
| c) L: space of one letter. | d) P: //. |
| e) J: omits /. | f) J: /for //. |
| g) P: one space. | h) L: <i>bstan</i> for <i>stan</i> . |
| i) F: <i>gtsang</i> . | j) Śikṣ P: <i>ma</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| k) P: <i>kyi</i> . F: <i>kyis</i> . | l) F: <i>kyis</i> . |
| m) F: <i>btam</i> . | n) F: one space. |
| o) L: <i>bstan</i> for <i>stan</i> . | |

VL11

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) N: <i>bya'o</i> // for <i>bya</i> /. Śikṣ P: omits /. | b) S: omits <i>zhe na / gang</i> , (haplography). |
| c) Śikṣ P: <i>gzhin</i> for <i>gzhan</i> . | d) J: /for //. |
| e) F: <i>ma sa</i> for <i>zos</i> . | f) P: inserts <i>ga</i> . |
| g) F: <i>snyom</i> . | h) L: /for //. |
| i) N: omits <i>bdag gi</i> . Śikṣ P: <i>gis</i> for <i>gi</i> . | j) L: <i>chungo</i> . |
| k) S: <i>ci'ang</i> . | l) S: omits <i>lta bu 'di</i> (haplography). |
| m) N: <i>lta bu 'di ni sems kyi</i> very cramped. | n) F: <i>snyom</i> . |

VL12

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) F: <i>zed</i> . | b) B: inserts an additional <i>mang</i> . |
| c) P: one space after <i>rung</i> . | |
| d) J: <i>mig tsang</i> , with space of half a letter between, for <i>mi gtsang</i> . | |
| e) F: <i>dag</i> for <i>dang</i> . | f) Śikṣ P: omits /. |
| g) L: <i>gso'</i> for <i>gso</i> . N: <i>bsa</i> for <i>gso</i> . | h) F: <i>ba'i</i> ? |
| i) N: /for //. | |

VL13

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) N: omits <i>dge slong</i> . |
| c) N: omits <i>spyod</i> . | d) M: inserts /. |
| e) N: omits /. | f) F: inserts /. |
| g) N: <i>na</i> for <i>la</i> . | h) M: <i>ci</i> . |
| i) L: <i>pas</i> for <i>pa</i> . | j) F: <i>bzi</i> . |
| k) B: <i>brjod</i> for <i>brjid</i> . L: omits <i>kyis brjid</i> (haplography). | m) F: <i>lo</i> . |
| l) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | o) F: <i>pa'i</i> . |
| n) F: <i>ra</i> below line. N: <i>bsgyur</i> for <i>sgyur</i> . | q) F: omits <i>dang</i> . |
| p) N: <i>spang</i> for <i>spangs</i> . | s) M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| r) P: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | u) L: inserts <i>du</i> . |
| t) B: <i>pral</i> for <i>bral</i> . | w) F: omits <i>pa</i> . |
| v) M: <i>ci</i> . | |

- x) F: *zhing* for *bzhin*.
- z) L: *bu'i* for *bu*.
- ab) F: omits *ci'i phyir*.
- ad) L: *bar* for *par*.
- af) F: *phyiro*.

- y) F: omits /.
- aa) S: omits /.
- ac) N: *yid* for *yi*.
- ae) F: *ba'i*.

VI.14

- a) B: '*dud* for *bdud*.
- c) F: *kyi*.
- e) F: omits *mo*. L: *bsamo*.
- g) F: *nga ni* for *nga'i*.
- i) L: omits *kyis*.
- k) P: *spyad*. F: *sbyar*.
- m) L: omits *spyod*.

- b) F: *lasam*.
- d) B: *bdung* for *bdud*.
- f) F: /.
- h) M: inserts /.
- j) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- l) F: inserts //.
- n) F: inserts /.

VII.1

- a) M: *sbyong*.
- c) S: *yong*.
- e) M: omits /.
- g) B: *che* for *cha*.
- i) M: *ba'i*.
- k) J: omits //.
- m) L: omits *yin*.
- n) F: *phyir* written as *phyi'* and ' corrected to *ra*.
- p) F: *pas* for *pa'i*.
- r) N: / for //?
- b) M: *ci*.
- d) F: *byi'i*.
- f) L: omits *gos*.
- h) B: *spyod pa* for *sbyor ba*.
- j) F: *yino*.
- l) F: *par*.
- o) N: *yino*.
- q) F: omits *tan*.

VII.2

- a) P: one space.
- b) F: //, end of line.

VII.3

- a) L: *ma'o* for *ba'o*.

VII.4

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- b) B: *dor ba* for *khrod pa*. F: omits *pa*. P: rewritten, and one space after *pa*.
- c) B: *pos* for *pas*. M: *bas* for *pas*. F: inserts /.
- e) F: *kyi*.
- g) F: *gnyan*.
- i) B: *pa* for *ba*.
- k) L: omits /.
- m) F: omits *dge slong*.
- n) M: omits *pa'i phyag dar khrod pa* (haplography).
- o) M: inserts /.
- q) F: *bshado*.
- d) F: inserts *khrod*.
- f) M: omits *pa*.
- h) F: omits *pa*.
- j) N: *gyi* for *gyis*.
- l) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
- p) M: *yino*.
- r) F: omits *bar bya*.

VII.5

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| a) J: <i>du</i> for <i>tu</i> . | b) F: <i>btsang</i> . |
| c) L: inserts <i>zhing</i> . | d) F: inserts <i>dogs</i> . |
| e) M: <i>bar</i> . | f) L: ' <i>jigs</i> for ' <i>jig</i> . |
| g) F: ' <i>byur</i> . | h) S: <i>ba</i> . F: <i>ba'i</i> , and inserts <i>phying</i> . |
| i) J: <i>logs</i> for <i>legs</i> ? | j) M: inserts /. |

VII.6

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) B: space of two letters. |
| c) F: omits <i>pa</i> . | d) F: omits <i>zhi bar</i> . |
| e) F: <i>pa'</i> . | f) F: <i>rgo</i> . |
| g) P: <i>zhe sdang nye bar zhi bar bya ba'i phyir</i> a bit cramped. | |
| h) S: <i>ngar</i> . | i) F: ' <i>gyur</i> . |
| j) L: <i>tham'd</i> for <i>thams cad</i> [end of line]. | k) F: /. |
| l) F: <i>phyin</i> ? | |
| m) F: ' <i>chos</i> written below the line in a different hand. | |
| n) F: <i>bsag</i> for <i>gsag</i> . N: <i>bsags</i> for <i>gsag</i> ? | o) M: inserts /. |

VII.7

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . L: inserts <i>de</i> . | b) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| c) S: <i>ngper</i> . | d) F: inserts <i>khrod</i> . |
| e) S: <i>su'ang</i> . | f) N: <i>bskyed</i> for <i>skyed</i> . S: inserts <i>cing</i> . |
| g) S: <i>su'ang</i> . | h) N: <i>bskyed</i> for <i>skyed</i> . |
| i) M: <i>to</i> . | j) F: inserts <i>de</i> . |
| k) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | l) L: omits <i>dang</i> . |
| m) N: <i>bar</i> for <i>par</i> . | n) L: <i>dag</i> for <i>bdag</i> . |
| o) L: omits /. | p) L: omits /. |
| q) S: <i>lta</i> . | |
| r) J: at the end of a line, a space of seven letters, and the beginning of the next line, another space of seven letters. | |
| s) F: inserts <i>khrod</i> . | t) F: <i>bu</i> . |
| u) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . | v) P: one space between <i>de</i> and ' <i>i</i> . |
| w) M: <i>la</i> for <i>pa</i> . L: inserts /. | x) F: omits <i>phyag dar khrod pa</i> . |
| y) J: /for //. | |

VII.8

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) F: <i>song</i> . | b) F: <i>nam</i> . |
| c) F: <i>kyis</i> . | d) P: / (second / broken?). |
| e) F: <i>rnams</i> written above line. | f) F: <i>ma'i</i> written, corrected to <i>ma'o</i> . |
| g) D <i>ba'i</i> . F: <i>pa rnams kyi</i> for <i>pa'i</i> . | h) F: <i>sangs</i> for <i>sbyangs</i> . |
| i) F: <i>pa</i> . | j) F: <i>kyis</i> . |
| k) B: <i>rtan</i> for <i>rtan</i> . N: <i>ston</i> for <i>rtan</i> . | l) P: /. |
| m) L: omits <i>kun</i> . | n) J: /for //. |
| o) N: <i>tinge</i> . | p) D <i>kyi</i> . F: <i>kyis</i> . |
| q) L: omits <i>ba'o</i> // ' <i>di ni ting nge 'dzin gyi phung</i> . | r) M: <i>namr</i> . |

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|--|
| s) | J: <i>gol</i> for <i>grol</i> ? | t) | F: <i>pa'o</i> for <i>ba'o</i> . N: <i>ngo</i> for <i>ba'o</i> . |
| u) | J: /for //. P: second /added later. | v) | F: <i>rnams</i> . |
| w) | M: <i>rnām</i> r. | x) | B: <i>pa'i</i> for <i>ba'i</i> . |
| y) | M: <i>pa'i</i> . | z) | F: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| aa) | S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | ab) | B: <i>med pa</i> for <i>mang ba</i> . P: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| ac) | N: omits /. | ad) | P: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| ae) | N: omits /. | af) | F: omits <i>med</i> . |
| ag) | L: <i>ro</i> for <i>ba'o</i> . | | |

VII.9

- | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------|
| a) | S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) | F: <i>kyi</i> . |
| c) | F: <i>chogs</i> . | d) | S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| e) | N: omits /. | f) | F: inserts <i>bu'i</i> . |
| g) | B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . | h) | F: <i>btan</i> . |
| i) | F: <i>bar</i> . | j) | M: <i>sbyar</i> . |
| k) | N: omits /. | l) | F: //. |

VII.10

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|-------------------------------------|
| a) | S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) | L: omits <i>dge slong</i> . |
| c) | B: omits <i>kyis</i> . F: <i>gyis</i> for <i>kyis</i> . | d) | B: <i>che</i> for <i>cha</i> . |
| e) | P: <i>gos kyis cha ba</i> cramped. | f) | M: <i>bar</i> . |
| g) | F: <i>gyis</i> . | h) | M: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| i) | L: <i>rgyun</i> for <i>rgyan</i> . | j) | L: <i>sgra</i> for <i>sbra</i> . |
| k) | S: omits <i>dang</i> . | l) | F: <i>ma</i> . |
| m) | M: inserts /. | n) | S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| o) | M: <i>yino</i> . | p) | F: //. |
| q) | F: <i>kyi</i> . | r) | B: <i>che</i> for <i>cha</i> . |
| s) | B: <i>spyod pa</i> for <i>sbyor ba</i> . P: possibly <i>spyod</i> but unclear. | u) | F: <i>'byung</i> . |
| t) | B: inserts <i>brtson pa de dag gi</i> (dittography). | | |
| v) | L: <i>spangs</i> for <i>spong</i> . | | |

VII.11

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|
| a) | S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) | F: <i>btsang</i> . |
| c) | F: <i>pha'i</i> . | d) | F: <i>soms</i> . |
| e) | F: <i>la</i> for <i>dang</i> . | f) | B: <i>pa'i</i> for <i>ba'i</i> . |
| g) | F: <i>la</i> for <i>na</i> . | h) | D <i>ba'i</i> . |
| i) | B: omits <i>rgyang</i> . P: <i>kyang</i> for <i>rgyang</i> . | j) | L: <i>bsus te</i> for <i>bsu ste</i> . |
| k) | F: <i>bgo</i> . | l) | L: <i>dag</i> for <i>bdag</i> . |
| m) | D <i>ba'i</i> . | n) | L: inserts <i>ni</i> . |
| o) | F: <i>gis</i> . | p) | B: <i>skun</i> for <i>skud</i> . L: <i>bsku</i> for <i>skud</i> . |
| q) | F: <i>skude</i> . | r) | N: omits /. |

VII.12

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|--------------------|
| a) | F: <i>byas</i> . | b) | F: <i>dagis</i> /. |
| c) | F: <i>byasu</i> . | | |
| d) | B: omits <i>khör</i> . P: <i>gcig khör</i> cramped. M: writes <i>kho ra</i> for <i>khör</i> . | | |

- e) F: yul.
g) P: *ster ba* cramped.

- f) B: *mi* for *ma*.
h) B: // for /.

VII.13

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
c) M: *la* for *pa*.
e) F: *gis*.

- b) L: inserts *pa'i*.
d) N: omits *chu*.
f) F: omits *rab tu*.

VII.14

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
c) P: four spaces here.
e) F: *par*.
g) F: *pa*.

- b) F: *ltar*.
d) F: *la* for *pa*.
f) F: *gis*.
h) L: inserts /.

VII.15

- a) F: omits *ni*.
c) F: *gyi* for *te*.
e) F: *bar*.

- b) L: *par* for *pa*.
d) M: *par*.

VII.16

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
c) F: *nge'i*.
e) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
g) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
i) B: *don* for *ngon*.
k) P: one space.
m) F: *khye'u*.
khri'i.
o) M: *na* for *du*.
q) L: *nam* /for *nas*.
s) F: omits *der*.
u) L: *go* for *bgo*.
w) S: *srungs* for *srung*. F: *srü*.
y) N: *mi* for *ci*.

- b) F: space with four *tshegs* in it.
d) J: /for //.
f) L: space of 23 letters.
h) N: *gyin* for *gyon*.
j) P: *bar*.
l) M: inserts /.
n) M: omits '*am khri'i*. F: *khre'u gi* for
p) L: omit /.
r) F: *chagsar* for '*chag sar*.
t) B: *bsgoms* for *bsgos*.
v) F: *kyis*.
x) S: *la'ang*.
z) F: //.

VII.17

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
c) F: *nge'i*.
d) N: *bsgyur* for *sgyur?*
d) J: *sta* for *ste*.
f) F: *le'i* for *la'i*. L: *lu'i* for *la'i*.
h) F: *go*.
j) M: *ba'i*.
l) F: *kyis*.

- b) M: *ci*.
e) N: *sdangs* for *spangs?*
e) F: omits /.
g) N: omits /.
i) N: *tam* for *tam?*
k) S: *ris*.

VIL18

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) S: omits <i>ngas</i> . |
| c) S: inserts <i>ngas</i> . | d) B: <i>ras</i> for <i>dar</i> . P: one space after <i>dar</i> . |
| e) J: <i>ngam</i> for <i>ngas</i> . | f) M: <i>thamd</i> . |
| g) S: inserts /. | h) D <i>ba'i</i> . |
| i) P: <i>las</i> . | j) M: <i>yino</i> . |

VIL19

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) F: <i>khyodang</i> . |
| c) F: <i>nge'i</i> . | d) F: <i>bslob</i> . |
| e) F: <i>rkam</i> . | f) S: inserts /. |
| g) N: <i>mnon</i> for <i>non</i> . | h) D <i>bar</i> . |
| i) N: inserts <i>dang</i> . | j) F: <i>zed</i> . |
| k) M: <i>bar</i> . | l) F: omits /. |
| m) L: omits /. | n) B: <i>lus</i> for <i>lug</i> . |
| o) B: <i>pu</i> for <i>bu</i> . | p) B: <i>rtag</i> for <i>rita</i> . |
| q) N: <i>shol</i> for <i>gshol</i> . | r) F: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| s) F: omits <i>dag</i> . | t) P: <i>bar</i> . |
| u) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | v) F: omits <i>la</i> . |
| w) F: <i>bar</i> . | x) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>ba</i> . |
| y) N: inserts <i>mod</i> . | z) S: <i>kyis</i> . |
- B [end of line]: // for /. D, F, J, N: omit /.
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| aa) F: <i>'byung</i> . | ab) M: inserts /. |
| ac) L: inserts /. | ad) F: <i>bar</i> . |
| ae) J: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | af) F: <i>medo</i> . |
| ag) J: /for // [end of line]. | |

VIL20

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | b) D <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| c) F: <i>bar</i> . | d) S: omits <i>du</i> . |
| e) F: inserts <i>ba</i> . | f) B: <i>dur</i> for <i>ngur</i> . |
| g) P: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . | h) B: <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . |
| i) N: omits /. | j) J: <i>lhung</i> for <i>lhur</i> . |
| k) B: <i>dur</i> for <i>ngur</i> . | l) P: [end of line]: <i>smig</i> (?). |
| m) B: <i>gon</i> for <i>gyon</i> . P: <i>ya</i> -btags probably added later, and slight space after <i>gyon</i> . | o) B: <i>lus</i> for <i>gus</i> . |
| n) L: omits <i>dang</i> . M: inserts /. | q) F: <i>la</i> plus space for <i>lang</i> . |
| p) F: <i>smras</i> . | s) B: <i>khyab</i> for <i>khyim</i> . |
| r) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . | u) A: <i>'gyurd pa</i> for <i>'gyur ba</i> . |
| t) F: <i>bar</i> . | w) N: omits /. |
| v) F: corrected from <i>ni</i> , with <i>ya</i> written beneath <i>ni</i> . | y) A: / for //. |
| x) A: <i>myed</i> for <i>med</i> . | aa) A: <i>lend</i> for <i>len</i> . |
| z) F: inserts <i>la</i> . | ac) S: <i>ci'ang</i> . |
| ab) F: <i>yin</i> written above line. | ae) F: <i>phyiro</i> . |
| ad) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>med</i> . | |

VIL21

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 b) S: omits *tshe de'i*, skipping from one *de'i* to the next.
 c) M: inserts /.
 d) L: inserts *po*.
 e) F: *zed*.
 f) S: inserts /.
 g) F: omits *pa*.
 h) A: inserts *du*.
 i) F: *pa dang* for *cing*.
 j) N: omits /.
 k) M: *ci*.
 l) B: *ltar* for *lta ba*, but this seems to be a rewriting of *ra* for *ba* (?).
 m) A: *'dzind* for *'dzin*.
 n) M: *phyiro*.

VII.22

- a) S: *pa'i*.
 b) B: *la* for *pa*. F: *par* for *pa*.
 c) M: *bar*.
 d) A: inserts /. J: space of two letters; shad broken or removed?
 e) A: *mye* for *me*. F: *med* for *me*.
 f) N: omits *byed ba nyung ba* (haplography).
 g) F: *ba* for *pa*.
 h) F: *'dris bar* for *'drin par*.
 i) L: inserts /.
 j) P: spang. *yongs su* spang cramped.
 k) S: omits *gi*.
 l) M: inserts /.
 m) S: *su'ang*.
 n) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 o) A: inserts *su yang*.
 p) A: *myi stend* for *mi sten*. N: *bsten* for *sten*.
 q) F: inserts /.
 r) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 s) F: /.
 t) F: inserts *gis*.
 u) L: *bdag* for *pa dag*.
 v) A: *lend* for *len*.
 w) M: *ba* for *pa*.
 x) F: omits *du*.
 y) P: *gis*, but *sa* cramped.
 z) F: *'tshe*.
 aa) A: *myed* for *med*.
 ab) F: inserts *pa*.
 ac) A: omits *cag*.
 ad) A: *ji'i* for *ci'i*.
 ae) F: *phyir* written below line.
 af) P: *ba'i*.
 ag) F: *byin* for *sbyor*.
 ah) F: *pa*.
 ai) F: omits *can*.
 aj) M: inserts /.
 ak) L: *nyungo*.

VII.23

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 b) P: inserts /.
 c) F: *kyis*.
 d) F: *ba* for *zhing*. M: inserts /.
 e) A: *'byord* for *'byor*.
 f) F: omits *spyod*.
 g) M: *rnair*.
 h) A: *smind* for *smin*.
 i) A: *rtond* for *rton*. L: *ston* for *rton*.
 j) A: omits /.
 k) A: *dond tu* for *don du*. F: *tu* for *du*.
 l) L: inserts /.

VII.24

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 b) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 c) M: *rnair*.
 d) A: *smayind* for *smin*.
 e) N: inserts /.
 f) A: *rold* for *rol*.
 g) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 h) A: *lend* for *len*.
 i) N: omits /.
 j) A: omits *mi*.

- k) A: *lend* for *len*.
 m) F: *rgo*.
 o) F: /.

- l) M: *thamd*.
 n) F: *bar*.

VIL25

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 c) A: *thard* for *thar*. L: *gyur* for *thar*.
 e) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 g) S: inserts /.
 i) B: *pa* for *kyi*. A: inserts /.
 k) B: omits /.
 m) N: omits /.
 o) F: *pa*.
 q) N: *lia* for *litar*.
 s) N: inserts *nyid*.
 u) L: 'gyur ro // for 'gyur /.
 w) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 y) N: omits /.

- b) A: omits *tha na*. L: *mar* for *na*.
 d) N: *cig* for *gcig*.
 f) A: *myi* for *mi*. M: inserts /.
 h) A: *myi* for *mi*.
 j) L: inserts /.
 l) F: omits *ni*.
 n) A: *sbyard* for *sbyar*. F: *byas* for *sbyar*.
 p) A: omits /.
 r) A: 'dzind tu for 'dzin du. F: *tu* for *du*.
 t) F: *yang*.
 v) P: *gyur la gzhan* cramped.
 x) F: inserts /.

VIL26

- a) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 c) A: *gsold* for *gsol*.
 e) F: *na* for *kyi*? The letter looks almost like *cha* (?). f) M: *serinn*.
 g) M: *nyidu*.
 i) F: *kyi*.
 b) L: inserts /.
 d) L: *pa* for *pa'i*, and insert *chen po'i*.
 h) A: *bsgrub* for *sgrub*.

VIL27

- a) A: *stsald* for *stsal*.
 c) S: *srungs* for *srung*.
 e) M: *bzhino*.
 g) M: *nyidu*.
 i) L: *gzung* for *bzung*.
 b) B: *to* // for *pa* /. P: // for /.
 d) A: omits *de*.
 f) P: one space.
 h) M: *serinn*.

VIL28

- a) N: *dga'o* for *dga' bo*.
 c) F: //.
 e) A: omits /.
 g) P: *ba'i*.
 b) A: *stsald* for *stsal*.
 d) N: *dga'o* for *dga' bo*.
 f) F: *khyims*.

VIL29

- a) A: *gsold* for *gsol*.
 c) D: *gzung* for *bzung*.
 e) F: *kyis*.
 g) A: *mying* for *ming*.
 i) M: *ci*.
 b) M: inserts /.
 d) B: *sa* may have been erased here.
 f) F: 'di.
 h) F: *bzung* for *ming ci*.

VII.30

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) A: <i>stsald</i> for <i>stsal</i> . | b) P: //. |
| c) N: <i>dga'o</i> for <i>dga'bo</i> . | d) F: <i>kyis</i> . |
| e) M: inserts /. | f) F: <i>sdus</i> . |
| g) S: <i>zhig</i> . | h) N: <i>sbyang</i> for <i>sbyangs</i> . |
| i) F: omits <i>dang ldan pa yongs su 'dzin pa dang / tshul khrims</i> . | |
| j) A: ' <i>chald</i> for ' <i>chal</i> . | k) L: <i>spang</i> for <i>spa</i> . |
| l) A: <i>gong</i> for ' <i>gong</i> . | m) B: <i>bkod pa</i> for ' <i>gong ba</i> . |
| n) A: <i>che</i> for <i>che'i</i> . | o) F: <i>che'i</i> . |
| p) P: one space. | q) L: <i>sbyor ba'i</i> for <i>sgo'i</i> . |
| r) S: <i>zhig</i> . | |

VII.31

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) F: <i>kyi</i> . | b) A: <i>stsald</i> for <i>stsal</i> . |
| c) B: <i>pa</i> for <i>nas</i> . P: <i>pa dang</i> (cramped) for <i>nas</i> . | d) S: <i>srungs</i> for <i>srung</i> . |
| e) N: <i>dga'o</i> for <i>dga'bo</i> . | f) A: <i>myi</i> for <i>mi</i> . |
| g) L: <i>lha dang / mi dang / lha ma yin dang</i> cramped into the space of 8 letters. | |
| h) F: <i>pa'i</i> . | i) B: // for /. |
| j) M: <i>bar</i> . | k) F: <i>stod</i> . |

VII.32

- | | |
|---|---|
| a) F: <i>ma</i> written below line. | b) F: <i>pa</i> written below line. |
| c) L: <i>po</i> for <i>po'i le'u</i> . | d) F: inserts <i>ba</i> for <i>pa</i> . L: inserts <i>ba'i le'u</i> . |
| e) L: omits <i>rtsa</i> . | f) B: inserts // // . P: two spaces. |
| g) J (?), S: / for //. | h) S: <i>rendra</i> . |
| i) B: <i>cher</i> for <i>chen</i> . | |
| j) L: <i>tsha</i> for <i>tstsha</i> . S: <i>tsa</i> for <i>tstsha</i> . B: one letter space after <i>tstsha</i> . | |
| k) M: <i>dhe</i> for <i>de</i> . | l) B: <i>zhugs</i> for <i>zhus te</i> . L: omits <i>zhus te</i> . |
| m) B: <i>gtam</i> for <i>gtan</i> . | |

SECTION IV

The Chinese Edition

Sigla for the sources of the Chinese edition

Those editions consulted directly are indicated in **bold type**. The others are noted on the basis of notes in the Taishō and Jin editions. See the Introduction for more details on all these editions.

- | | |
|----------|--|
| A | Ōtani University Dunhuang manuscript 707. |
| B | London Dunhuang manuscript Stein 5664. |
| C | The <i>Jin</i> 金 edition (1149-1173). |
| F | The <i>Fangshan yunju-si shijing</i> 房山雲居寺石經 edition (1055-56). |
| G | The <i>Chongning</i> 崇寧 (1080-1104) or <i>Pilu</i> 毘盧 edition (1113-1172). |
| J | The <i>Jisha</i> 積砂 edition (1231). |
| K | The second Korean edition 高麗 (1240). |
| M | The <i>Ming</i> 明 edition (1589-1677). |
| N | The Southern Ming 南藏 edition (1372-?) |
| Q | The <i>Qing</i> 清 edition (1735-1738). |
| S | The <i>Song</i> 宋 edition (1132-?). |
| T | The <i>Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō</i> 大正新修大藏經 (1924-34). |
| Y | The <i>Yuan</i> 元 edition (1278-1294) |
| Z | The <i>Zifu</i> 資福 edition (1239). |

大寶積經
卷第一百一十三

北梁¹沙門釋²道龔於張掖³譯

寶梁聚會

第四十四⁴

沙門品

第一

L1

C 391b4, J 159a5, K 882b4, T 638c11:

如是我聞一時佛在王舍城耆闍崛山中。與大比丘衆八千人俱菩薩摩訶薩萬六千人。皆不退轉於阿耨多羅三藐三菩提。盡是一生補處。悉從十方諸佛世界而來集會。

L2

C 391b8, J 159a8, K 882b8, T 638c14:

爾時。摩訶迦葉白佛言。世尊。所言沙門。云何爲沙門。佛告。迦葉。所謂。沙門者。

¹

G, J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 涼 for 梁.

²

F, G, S, Z: omit 釋.

³

J, M, N, Q, Y: contain 於張掖, omitted in others.

⁴

F, G, J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: insert: 之一.

- (1) 寂滅故。
- (2) 調伏故。
- (3) 受教故。
- (4) 戒¹身淨故。
- (5) 入禪定故。
- (6) 得智慧故。
- (7) 解如實義得解脫故。
- (8) 於三脫門無所疑故。
- (9) 安住聖人所行法故。
- (10) 善修四念處故。
- (11) 離一切不善法故。
- (12) 安住四正勤故。
- (13) 善修四如意足故。
- (14) 成就信根故。
- (15) 信佛法僧故。
- (16) 成就堅信於佛法僧故。
- (17) 不信餘道法故。
- (18) 勤行離一切煩惱故。
- (19) 善修七菩提分離一切不善如實修一切善法故。

¹

C: 我 for 戒。

- (20) 善知正念正智方便故。
- (21) 專念一切諸善法故。
- (22) 善知定慧方便故。
- (23) 成就五力故。
- (24) 不爲一切煩惱之所亂故。
- (25) 善修七菩提分故。
- (26) 善知一切法中因緣方便故。
- (27) 善知聖道方便故。
- (28) 善知正見正定方便故。
- (29) 得四辯力不信外道故。
- (30) 依義不依語。依智不依識。依了義經不依不了義經。
依法不依人故。
- (31) 離四魔故。
- (32) 善知五陰故。
- (33) 斷一切煩惱故。
- (34) 得最後身故。
- (35) 離生死道故。
- (36) 離一切愛故。
- (37) 勤行知苦斷集證滅修道故。
- (38) 善見四聖諦故

- (39) 於佛法中不信餘道故。
- (40) 所作已辦故。
- (41) 斷一切漏故。
- (42) 修八背捨故。
- (43) 釋梵天王之所讚故。
- (44) 從本已來專心行道故。
- (45) 樂阿蘭若處故。
- (46) 安住聖法中故。
- (47) 樂佛法儀式故。
- (48) 心不傾動故。
- (49) 不親近出家在家衆故。
- (50) 心樂獨行如犀角故。
- (51) 畏於人衆多惱亂故。
- (52) 樂住獨處故。
- (53) 常怖畏三界故。
- (54) 得實沙門果故。
- (55) 離一切惓¹望故。
- (56) 離世²八法故。所謂利衰毀譽稱譏苦樂。

¹ G, J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 希 for 惓.

² J: 出 for 世.

- (57) 堅心不動如地故。
- (58) 護彼我意無所犯故。
- (59) 不濁故。
- (60) 正行故。
- (61) 心行成就如虛空故。
- (62) 於諸形相心無染著如虛空中動手無所礙¹ 故。

迦葉。若能成就如是行法是名沙門。

釋氏要覽 T. 2127 (LIV) 259a5-10:

寶積經云。沙門者。寂滅故。調伏故。受教故。戒身淨故如實義故。得解脫故。離三十八法故。堅心不動如地故。護彼我意故。於諸形相無染著如空中動手無所礙故。成就如是多法故。名沙門。

孔雀經音義 T. 2244 (LXI) 758c8-759a7, in the definition of 沙門 begins: 大寶積經沙門品云。佛告。迦葉。所謂沙門者, and then quotes verbatim the entire passage until the end.

I.3

J 159b8, K 882c22, T 639a15:

爾時。摩訶迦葉白佛言。世尊。未曾有也。如來善說沙門德行。世尊。若未來世有諸沙門非實沙門自言我是沙門。非梵行人自言我有梵行。如是之人即已侵損如來無量阿僧祇劫所修集² 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提。佛告。迦葉。如是侵損如來菩提之罪說不可盡。迦葉。我滅度後。汝及餘大弟子等亦皆滅度。又此世界諸大菩薩

¹ K: 碍 for 礙.

² M, Q: 習 for 集.

皆至他方諸佛世界。爾時於我法中當有比丘於諸所行心多諂曲。
迦葉。我今當說沙門之垢沙門過罪。迦葉。後末法中當有比丘不
修身不修戒不修心不修慧。癡如小兒。向於闇冥而無所知心不調
伏成沙門垢。

I.4

J 159b20, K 883a13, T 639a27:

迦葉。云何沙門垢。迦葉。沙門¹ 垢有三十二出家之人所應遠離。
何等三十二。

- (1) 欲覺是沙門垢。
- (2) 瞋覺是沙門垢。
- (3) 惱覺是沙門垢。
- (4) 自讚是沙門垢。
- (5) 毀他² 是沙門垢。
- (6) 邪求利養是沙門垢。
- (7) 因利求利是沙門垢。
- (8) 損他施福是沙門垢
- (9) 覆藏罪過是沙門垢。
- (10) 親近在家人是沙門垢。

¹ J, M, N, Q, Y: insert 之。

² T: 地 for 他。Probably a misprint.

- (11) 親近出家人是沙門垢¹。
- (12) 樂於衆鬧是沙門垢。
- (13) 未得利養作方便求是沙門垢。
- (14) 於他利養心生希望²是沙門垢。
- (15) 自於利養心不知足是沙門垢。
- (16) 於他利養中心生嫉妬是沙門垢。
- (17) 常求他過是沙門垢。
- (18) 不見己過是沙門垢。
- (19) 於解脫戒而不堅持是沙門垢。
- (20) 不知慚愧是沙門垢。
- (21) 無恭恪³意心慢掉動無有羞恥是沙門垢。
- (22) 起諸結使是沙門垢
- (23) 逆十二因緣是沙門垢。
- (24) 攝取邊見是沙門垢。
- (25) 不寂滅不離欲是沙門垢。
- (26) 樂於生死不樂涅槃是沙門垢。
- (27) 好樂外典是沙門垢。

¹ According to the Taishō footnote, a note in the Ming edition says that the Southern Song edition 宋南藏 lacks the character 垢.

² K: 悌 for 希.

³ The term 恭恪 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400a21.

- (28) 五蓋覆心起諸煩惱是沙門垢。
- (29) 不信業報是沙門垢。
- (30) 畏三脫門是沙門垢。
- (31) 謗深妙法不寂滅行是沙門垢。
- (32) 於三寶中心不尊敬是沙門垢。

迦葉。是名沙門三十二垢。若能離此諸垢是名沙門。

I.5

J 159c10, K 883b20, T 639b18:

迦葉。又有八法覆沙門行。何等八。

- 一者。不敬順師長。
- 二。不尊敬法。
- 三。不善思惟。
- 四。所未聞法聞已誹謗。
- 五。聞無衆生無我無命無人法已心生驚畏。
- 六。聞一切行本來無生已而解有爲法不解無爲法。
- 七。聞說次第法已墮大深處。
- 八。聞一切法無生無性無出已而心迷沒。

迦葉。是名八法覆於沙門行。如是八法出家沙門應當遠離。

I.6

J 159c17, K 883c1, T 639b26:

迦葉。我不說剃頭法服名爲沙門。所謂有功德儀式具足者乃名爲

沙門。迦葉。沙門身服袈裟心應遠離貪恚癡行。何以故。心無貪
 恚癡行我乃聽著¹袈裟。迦葉。若心有貪恚癡法而身著袈裟。除
 專心持戒餘不持戒人。則爲燒滅袈裟。何以故。聖人表式隨順寂
 滅行慈悲心。離欲滅者之所應服。迦葉。汝今聽我說聖人表式有
 十二事。何等十二。迦葉。

- (1) 持戒是聖人表式。
- (2) 禪定是聖人表式。
- (3) 智慧是聖人表式。
- (4) 解脫是聖人表式。
- (5) 解脫知見是聖人表式。
- (6) 入四聖諦是聖人表式。
- (7) 能解十二因緣是聖人表式。
- (8) 行四無量心是聖人表式。
- (9) 行於四禪是聖人表式。
- (10) 行四無色定是聖人表式。
- (11) 入四向正定是聖人表式。
- (12) 斷一切漏是聖人表式。

迦葉。是名聖人十二表式。

¹ The term 聽著 found in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400a22 apparently refers to this place.

I.7

J 160a2, K 883c19, T 639c11:

迦葉。若有比丘不具足聖人十二表式身服袈裟者。我說此比丘是邪法行。非寂滅行。離佛法行。不近涅槃。順生死行。爲魔所鉤¹。不度生死。於正法退而行邪法。

I.8

J 160a6, K 883c23, T 639c15:

迦葉。是故出家比丘身服袈裟時 若未得沙門果者。應以八法敬重袈裟。何等八。於身袈裟應起

- (1) 塔想。
- (2) 世尊想。
- (3) 寂滅想。
- (4) 慈想。
- (5) 敬如佛想。
- (6) 慚想。
- (7) 愧想。
- (8) 令我來世離貪恚癡

具沙門法想。迦葉。是名八法敬重袈裟。

I.9

J 160a10, K 884a6, T 639c20:

¹

J, M, Y: 拘 for 鉤.

迦葉。若有於四聖種不行知足離沙門法亦不以此八法敬重袈裟者。而彼別有似沙門數墮小地獄¹。迦葉。彼地獄中似沙門者。於中受罪衣鉢支體皆悉熾然。坐臥之處凡有所用物亦皆熾然。如大火聚似沙門者。受如是罪。何以故。成就不淨身口意業故。墮是罪處。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 101a4-11:

如寶積經說。此因者。佛言。迦葉波。若復嚴飾於身而不密護。壞沙門功德。法者是袈裟衣。雖持於身而心不生尊重。復次迦葉波。如是色相。名相似沙門。以是緣故。當墮地獄。迦葉波。以沙門色相相似故。於地獄中衣熱鐵衣。以覆頭上應器敷具熱鐵所成。所有一切受用資具。悉皆猛焰熾然焰爛。彼說色相相似沙門得受是苦。

I.10

J 160a16, K 884a13, T 639c26:

迦葉。若非沙門自言我是沙門。非梵行者自言我有梵行。若有持戒功德具足人所右遶恭敬尊重者。若破戒比丘受其禮敬供養而不自知惡。彼惡比丘以是不善根故得八輕法。何等八。

一。作愚癡。

二。口瘡瘻。

三。受身瘡陋²。

¹ Half of this sentence actually belongs, according to my division of the text, with the end of I.8, but rather than split the sentence I print it all here. The *Śikṣāsamuccaya* quotation I have made correspond with the Chinese of the *Ratnarāśi* as I print it, although here too the first part actually belongs to the preceding paragraph.

² The term 瘡陋 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400a23.

四。顏貌醜惡其面側戾見者¹ 蚩²笑³。

五。轉受女人身作貧窮婢使。

六。其形羸瘦夭損壽命。

七。人所不敬常有惡名。

八。不值佛世。

迦葉。是破戒比丘受持戒者。禮敬供養得如是八種⁴法。迦葉。

破戒比丘聞如是法已應當不受持戒比丘禮敬供養。

四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 T. 1804 (XL) 132a8-13:

寶聚經云。若破戒比丘受他持戒者。恭敬禮拜得八輕法。一。作愚癡。二。瘡癰。三。顏貌醜陋。四。其面側戾見者蚩笑。五。轉受女身作貧窮婢使。六。形體羸瘦夭損壽命。七。人所不敬常有惡名。八。不值佛世。

四分律行事鈔資持記 T. 1805 (XL) 395a24-25 (allusion):

寶梁中。八輕者。由無慚慢易有德即因心也。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947b22-27:

又寶梁經云。若破戒比丘受持戒者。禮敬供養不自知惡得八輕法。何等爲八。一。作愚癡。二。口瘡癰。三。受身殘陋。四。顏貌醜惡其面側戾見者蚩笑。五。轉受女人身作貧窮婢使。六。其形羸瘦夭損壽命。七。人所不敬常有惡名。八。不值佛世。

L11

J 160a26, K 884b2, T 640a7:

¹ N: 人 for 者.

² M: 嗤 for 蚩.

³ The term 蚩笑 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400a24-b1.

⁴ F, J, M, N, Q, Y: 輕 for 種.

迦葉。若有非沙門自言我是沙門。非梵行自言我有梵行。於此大地乃至無有涕唾¹分處。況舉足下足去來屈伸²。何以故。過去大王持此大地施與持戒有行德³者令於中行道。

四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 T. 1804 (XL) 132a13:

此破戒比丘者乃至大地無涕唾處。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947b28-c2:

佛言。若有非沙門自言是沙門。非梵行自言梵行。於此大地乃至無有涕唾處。況舉足下足去來屈伸。何以故。過去大王持此大地施與持戒有德行者令修行中道。

I.12

J 160a30, K 884b7, T 640a11:

迦葉。是破戒比丘舉足下足處一切信施不及此人。況僧坊及招提僧舍經行之處。若有房舍床⁴敷園林所有衣鉢臥具醫藥一切信施所不應受。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947c2-4:

是破戒比丘一切信施不及此人。況僧房舍之處。衣鉢臥具醫藥信施所不應受。

I.13

J 160b4, K 884b11, T 640a14:

迦葉。我今當說。若有非沙門自言我是沙門。非梵行自言我有梵

¹ The term 涕唾 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b2.

² J: 申 for 伸.

³ F: 行德 as 德行.

⁴ K: 牀 for 床.

行。不能必報信施如一毛端。何以故。聖衆福田猶如大海。最妙最勝於中。若有施主淨心信故以施種子種福田中。如此施主起無量施想。迦葉。若有破戒比丘。如分一毛以爲百分。若惡比丘受信施如一毛分。隨所受毛分。即損失施主爾所大海福報之分。不能畢報。迦葉。是故應淨其心受他信施。迦葉。應如是學。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947c4-6:

若有破戒比丘。如分一毛以爲百分。若惡比丘受信施如一毛分。隨所受毛分。即損施主。

I.14

J 160b12, K 884b22, T 640a23:

爾時。衆中有淨行少¹欲離垢²比丘二百人聞說是已捫³淚⁴而白⁵。世尊。我今當死不欲以不得沙門果受他信施乃至一食。佛言。善哉。善哉。善男子。汝如慚愧。畏於後世喻如金剛。即是現世瓔珞⁶。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 101a24-29:

又寶積經云。復次世尊。說是受用信施。爾時衆中離垢比丘。於此法律聞已悲泣。作如是言。世尊。我今寧取命終。不復得果。亦不受用一信施食。佛言。善哉。善哉。善男子。斯言清淨如是行相。

¹ G, S, Y, Z: omit 少. Q: 無 for 少. According to the Taishō footnote, a note in the Ming edition says that the northern edition 北藏 omits the character.

² M, N, Q, Y: 垢 for 垢. The term 離垢 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b3-4.

³ J, M, Q: 捫 for 捫.

⁴ The term 捫淚 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b5.

⁵ F: 言 for 白.

⁶ J: 瓔珞 for 瓔珞.

恥具惡作怖他世罪。

I.15

J 160b17, K 884c4, T 640a27:

善男子。我今當說世有二人應受信施。何等二。一者。勤行精進。二者。得解脫者。佛告。比丘。若有比丘得解脫者。行善法者。如我所說堅持戒者。觀一切行無常苦。一切法無我者。觀涅槃寂滅。願求欲得如是。比丘。受他信施搏如¹須彌必能報是信施之福。若有比丘受信施主施令此施主得大利益得大果報。何以故。常生福德。有三種福。

一。常施食。

二。僧坊舍。

三。行慈心。

此三福中慈心最勝。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 101a29-b6:

佛言。迦葉波。我知信施。此有二種。說名解脫。何等爲二。若離扼比丘及餘比丘。學我所行見諸行無常。領納諸受是苦。信解諸法無我求涅槃寂靜者。設食信施量等須彌及餘所施。畢竟清淨。若受施主物及信施食具大光明得大福報。所以者何。以諸增上慳貪令作福事。是爲慈心三摩鉢底。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 437b23-27:

佛言。善男子。我今說世有二人應受信施。何等爲二。一。勤行精進。二。得解脫。令此施主得大利益有三種施。一。常施食。二。

¹ The term 搏如 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b6.

僧坊舍。三。行慈心。此三福中慈心最勝。

L16

J 160b25, K 884c19, T 640b7:

佛告。比丘。若有比丘從施主受施。若衣鉢臥具飲食湯藥。受已若入無量定令彼施主得無量福得無量報。迦葉。譬如三千大千世界所有大海尚可竭盡而此施主所得福報不可得盡。迦葉。當知破戒比丘損於施主爾所福德。若受施主施已行於惡法損他信施。迦葉。如是說沙門垢。沙門過罪。沙門諂曲。沙門中賊。迦葉。持戒比丘應當專念遠離如是一切惡法。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 101b6-10:

復次。迦葉波。若比丘受施主所施衣服飲食已。思入無量三摩地者。令彼施主於作福事所求果報亦復無量。迦葉波。假使三千大千世界大海水竭。是所修福亦無有盡。

L17

J 160c3, K 885a1, T 640b16

迦葉。所謂沙門者。眼不流色中耳鼻舌身意不流法中。是故謂之沙門。選擇¹六入。了達六通。專念六念。安住六敬法。行六重法。是謂沙門。

¹

J, N: 擇選 for 選擇

比丘品

第二

II.1

J 160c8, K 885a7, T 640b21:

爾時。佛告迦葉。所言比丘。比丘者。能破煩惱故名比丘。破我想衆生想人想男想女想是謂比丘。復次。迦葉。有修戒修慧是名比丘。復次。迦葉。離恐畏故。度三有四流故。見有及流諸過患故。離一切有及流故。安處無畏道故。是名比丘。

II.2

J 160c13, K 885a13, T 640b26:

迦葉。若有比丘自知不成就如是之法及餘善法。又離是法行於餘道。迦葉。彼比丘非我弟子。我非彼師。

II.3

J 160c15, K 885a16, T 640b28:

迦葉。多有惡比丘壞我佛法。迦葉。非九十五種外道能壞我法。亦非諸餘外道能壞我法。除我法中所有癡人。此癡人輩能壞我法。迦葉。譬如師子獸¹中之王。若其死已虎狼鳥獸無有能得食其肉者。迦葉。師子身中自生諸蟲²還食其肉。迦葉。於我法中出如是等諸惡比丘。貪惜利養爲貪利所覆。不滅惡法。不修善法。不

¹ G, S: 狩 for 獸 and so in the following as well.

² J: 虫 for 蟲.

離妄語。迦葉。如是比丘能壞我法。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947c7-10:

譬如師子獸王。若有死已無有能得食其肉者。師子身中自生諸蟲還食其肉。於我法中出如是諸惡比丘。貪惜利養爲貪所覆。不識
[error for 滅?] 惡法。能壞我法。

II.4

J 160c23, K 885b2, T 640c7:

迦葉。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 貪。
- (2) 恚。
- (3) 癡。
- (4) 及我慢者。

是名惡比丘。

II.5

J 160c25, K 885b4, T 640c9:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 傲慢自大。
- (2) 無慚。
- (3) 無愧。
- (4) 不慎口過。

是名惡比丘。

II.6

J 160c27, K 885b7, T 640c11:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 掉動
- (2) 輕他。
- (3) 貪求利養。
- (4) 多行非法。

是名惡比丘。

II.7

J 160c28, K 885b9, T 640c13:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 多有姦¹ 僞。
- (2) 幻惑於人。
- (3) 多行邪命。
- (4) 多說惡言。

是名惡比丘。

II.8

J 161a1, K 885b12, T 640c15:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 現受他恩不知報之。

¹

J: 姦 for 姦. K: 姦 for 姦. Hereafter in general not noted.

- (2) 小恩於他責望大報。
- (3) 先受他恩而不憶念。
- (4) 侵損親友。

是名惡比丘。

II.9

J 161a3, K 885b15, T 640c18:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 受人信施失他福報。
- (2) 不善護戒。
- (3) 輕所受戒。
- (4) 不堅持律。

是名惡比丘。

II.10

J 161a6, K 885b18, T 640c20:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 有我論。
- (2) 有衆生論。
- (3) 有命論。
- (4) 有人論。

是名惡比丘。

II.11

J 161a8, K 885b20, T 640c22:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 不敬佛。
- (2) 不敬法。
- (3) 不敬僧。
- (4) 不敬戒。

是名惡比丘。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947c10-11:

當知是惡比丘成就四法。一。不敬佛。二。不敬法。三。不敬僧。
四。不敬戒。

II.12

J 161a10, K 885b22, T 640c24:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 若僧和合而心不悅。
- (2) 不樂獨處。
- (3) 樂於衆中。
- (4) 常論世俗所有言說。

是名惡比丘。

II.13

J 161a12, K 885c3, T 640c27:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 求於利養。
- (2) 求大名稱。
- (3) 求多知識。
- (4) 不住聖種。

是名惡比丘。

II.14

J 161a14, K 885c5, T 640c29:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 繫屬於魔。
- (2) 爲魔所害。
- (3) 多於睡眠。
- (4) 作善不喜。

是名惡比丘。

II.15

J 161a16, K 885c8, T 641a2:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 於佛法中朽敗。
- (2) 心懷諛諂。
- (3) 爲煩惱所害。
- (4) 離沙門果。

是名惡比丘。

II.16

J 161a19, K 885c11, T 641a4:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 爲姪欲所燒。
- (2) 瞋恚所燒。
- (3) 愚癡所燒。
- (4) 亦爲一切煩惱所燒。

是名惡比丘。

II.17

J 161a21, K 885c13, T 641a7:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 多遊姪里不知過惡。
- (2) 不知知足雖多學問。
- (3) 不知知足於所須物
- (4) 常懷嫉¹心不能施他。

是名惡比丘。

II.18

J 161a24, K 885c17, T 641a10:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

¹ G, S: 疾 for 嫉. J, M, N, Q, Y: 悋 for 嫉

- (1) 從闇入闇。
- (2) 從癡入癡。
- (3) 不見聖諦多生疑惑。
- (4) 常爲生死之所繫縛閉涅槃門。

是名惡比丘。

II.19

J 161a27, K 885c21, T 641a13:

復。有四法成就當知是惡比丘。何等四。

- (1) 身多姦行。
- (2) 口多姦行。
- (3) 意多姦行。
- (4) 儀式多姦行。

II.20

J 161a29, K 885c23, T 641a15:

云何身多姦行。安詳而行是身姦行。不左右視是身姦行。若左右視不過一尋是身姦行。邪命著衣是身姦行。諛諂行於空閑之處不求空閑所行之法。諛諂乞食不觀乞食相。諛諂著糞掃衣不知爲慚愧故。諛諂行於山窟樹下不知分別十二緣行。諛諂服於陳故棄藥不求甘露法藥。迦葉。是名身¹多姦²行。

¹ Here begins the Dunhuang fragment A.

² J: 奸 for 姦. A, K: 奸 for 姦. Hereafter in general not noted.

II.21

A 1, J 161b6, K 886a8, T 641a22:

迦葉。云何口多姦¹行。他識我。他請我²。如所求我已得。我不求利養而他送與我。細³妙供養我皆得。多利養我亦得。我常行善法⁴應受供養。我善問答。我能順法相。我能逆法相。我⁵於一切法解義非義。他⁶若如是問我我能如是答答已伏彼令其默⁷然。我說是已能⁸令大衆一切喜悅。亦令一切歎⁹言善哉¹⁰。令彼衆人請我。供養得。供養已復令施主請言¹¹數來。迦葉。若有不調伏口而有所說一切所言皆非正言是口多姦行。迦葉。是名口多姦行。

II.22

A 10, J 161b16, K 886a20, T 641b3:

迦葉。云何意多姦行。心所牽連貪求利養衣鉢臥具飲食¹²醫藥而

¹ J, K: 奸 for 姦. A inserts 他.

² A: The area which would have contained 他識我他請我 is torn off in the MS.

³ A: The area which would have contained 他送與我細 is torn off in the MS.

⁴ A: The area which would have contained 得我常行善法 is torn off in the MS.

⁵ A: The area we would have expected to contain 能逆法相我 is torn, but there looks to be only enough space for about three characters, not five.

⁶ A: omits 他.

⁷ J: 嘿 for 默.

⁸ A: omits 能.

⁹ A: 難 for 歎.

¹⁰ A: repeats 善哉.

¹¹ J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 我 for 言.

¹² A: omits 飲食.

口說言一切利養我所不須。心實多求而詐言知足。是名意多姦行。

II.23

A 13, J 161b19, K 886b1, T 641b6:

爾時。世尊而說偈言¹。

心求利養	口言知足	邪命求利	常無快樂
其心多姦	欺誑一切	如此之心	都不清淨
諸天龍神	有天眼者	諸佛世尊	咸共知見。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947c11-16:

爾時。世尊而說偈言。

心求利養。口言知足。邪命求利。常無快樂。

其心多姦。欺誑一切。如此之心。都不清淨。

諸天神龍。有天眼者。諸佛世尊。咸共知之。

II.24

A 18, J 161b23, K 886b6, T 641b11:

迦葉。如是惡比丘離善法儀式作邪命行墮三惡道²。

¹ J: 詩 for 言.

² A note in the Taishō says that “the above” is missing in the 聖本, meaning the Shōsōin manuscripts, but it is clear neither what “the above” means nor exactly which edition or manuscript is lacking the material.

旃陀羅¹ 品

第三

III.1

A 21, J 161b26, K 886b9, T 641b14:

佛告迦葉。云何旃陀羅沙門。迦葉。譬如旃陀羅常於塚²間行求死尸³。無慈悲心視於衆生。得見死尸心大喜⁴悅。迦葉。如是沙門旃陀羅常無慈心至施主家。行不善心。所求得已生貴重心。從施主家受利養已不教施主佛法毘尼。爲利養故親近在家。不爲法故。亦無慈心常求利養。迦葉。是名沙門旃陀羅。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947c17-22:

佛告迦葉。云何旃陀羅沙門。迦葉。譬如旃陀羅常於塚間行求死屍。無慈悲心視於衆生。得見死屍心大喜悦。如是沙門旃陀羅常無慈心至施主家。行不善心。所求得已生貴重心。從施主家受利養已不教佛法親近在家。亦無慈心常求利養。是名沙門旃陀羅。

III.2

A 27, J 161c2, K 886b17, T 641b20:

迦葉。如旃陀羅爲一切人之所捨離。所謂。大臣長者及諸小王刹利婆羅門并餘庶民乃至下賤之所⁵遠離。不欲共作知識。迦葉。

¹ A, M, Y insert: 沙門. The Shōsōin text inserts 尼.
² J: 冢 for 塚.
³ A, J: 屍 for 尸, and so in the following as well.
⁴ A: 歡 for 喜.
⁵ A: 人 for 所.

如是沙門旃陀羅。亦爲一切¹所遠²離。所謂。持戒有德³人所敬⁴者比丘比丘尼優婆塞優塞⁵夷天龍鬼神及乾闥婆。知其破戒行惡法故。迦葉。是名沙門旃陀羅。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947c22-23:
如是旃陀羅。爲一切人之所捨離。

III.3

A 34, J 161c9, K 886c2, T 641b27:

迦葉。如旃陀羅所有衣服飲食諸所用物。盡非好人之所愛樂。亦不受用。迦葉。如是沙門旃陀羅。若有衣鉢所用之物。皆是破戒非法身口意業諛諂⁶所得。持戒沙門婆羅門捨。不愛樂。亦不受用。於此人所生哀愍心。迦葉。是名沙門旃陀羅。

III.4

A 39, J 161c14, K 886c8, T 641c3:

迦葉。如旃陀羅以愧恥心持所用器從他乞食。迦葉。如是沙門旃陀羅。以愧恥心入於房舍及至他家。或到衆中。亦以愧心至於佛所。亦以愧心禮如來塔亦以愧心去來屈伸⁷。亦以愧心行住坐臥。一切所行皆有愧心覆藏惡法故。

-
- 1 A: inserts 之.
2 A: 捨 for 遠.
3 A: 得 for 德.
4 A: 欲 for 敬.
5 A, J, K: 婆 for 塞.
6 A: omits 諛諂.
7 J: 申 for 伸.

III.5

A 44, J 161c19, K 886c14, T 641c9:

迦葉。我今當說旃陀羅人所至之處不到善處。何以故。自行惡法故。迦葉。如是沙門旃陀羅所至之處亦不到善道。多作惡業無遮惡道法故。迦葉。是名沙門旃陀羅。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947c23-26:

如旃陀羅所至之處不到善處。何以故。自行惡法故。如是沙門旃陀羅所至之處亦不到善道。多作惡業無遮惡道法故。

III.6

A 48, J 161c23, K 886c19, T 641c12:

迦葉。云何沙門敗壞。迦葉。譬如好酒香味具者是¹酒²之醞³接⁴。取已盡下有糟滓⁵。人所惡賤無所施用。迦葉。如是敗壞沙門離於法味取煩惱⁶滓。人所惡賤無所施用。離持戒香嗅⁷諸煩惱⁸。若有至處不能自利亦不益他。迦葉。是名敗壞沙門。

III.7

A 53, J 161c28, K 887a2, T 641c18:

¹ M, N, Q: 足是 for 者是. J: 足者 for 者是. (According to the Taishō footnote, a note in the Ming edition says that the Southern Song edition 南宋藏 has 者 for 是. There seems to be some confusion here.)

² A: 酒是 for 是酒.

³ A: 提湖 for 醞翻.

⁴ J, M, N, Q, Y: 醉 for 接.

⁵ The term 糟滓 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b7-8.

⁶ A: 惚 for 惱.

⁷ G, J, M, S, Y: 臭 for 嗅. K: 鼻 for 嗅.

⁸ A: 惚 for 惱.

迦葉。敗壞者。如有所食變爲糞穢。臭惡不淨。人所厭離。迦葉。
如是敗壞沙門猶如糞穢。以身口意業不清¹淨故。迦葉。是名敗
壞沙門。

III.8

A 56, J 162a1, K 887a6, T 641c21:

迦葉。譬如敗種種大地中終不²生牙³實。迦葉。如是敗壞沙門。
雖在佛法⁴不生善根。不得沙門果。迦葉。是名敗壞沙門。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 947c26-27:⁵
譬如敗種終不生牙。如是敗壞沙門。

III.9

A 59, J 162a4, K 887a9, T 641c23:

迦葉。云何沙門篋⁶。迦葉。譬如畫篋⁷巧工所成中盛⁸嗅⁹穢
種種不淨。迦葉。如是¹⁰沙門篋¹¹。外現成就似沙門行。內有種
種垢穢行諸惡業。迦葉。是名沙門篋。

¹ A: omits 清.

² A: inserts 可.

³ G, J, M, S, Y: 芽 for 牙. A omits 牙.

⁴ M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: insert: 中.

⁵ The text adds after this paraphrase: 雖在佛法不生善根不得沙門果. I do not know if this is intended to correspond to any passage in the *Ratnarāṣi*.

⁶ The *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b9 lists the term (?) 門篋, but in fact the operative character is only 篋.

⁷ A: 陰 for 篋.

⁸ A: 咸 (?) for 盛.

⁹ A, G, J, K, M, S, Y: 臭 for 嗅.

¹⁰ A: inserts 淨.

¹¹ A: 陰 for 篋.

III.10

A 62, J 162a7, K 887a13, T 641c27:

迦葉。云何沙門拘¹欄荼²。迦葉。譬如拘³欄荼華⁴色貌⁵鮮
 好⁶。其體⁷堅韌⁸猶如木石。其氣嗅⁹穢猶如糞塗。有智之人
 若見此華不近不觸¹⁰遠避而去。愚人若見不知過患近而嗅¹¹之。
 迦葉。如是沙門拘¹²欄荼現似沙門行而有麤獷¹³傲慢自高臭穢不
 淨。又作破戒無儀式行。破於正見。迦葉。如是沙門拘¹⁴欄荼。
 智者不親近。不¹⁵禮敬右遶。以¹⁶惡人故而遠離之。迦葉。若有
 癡如小兒彼諸癡人之所親近禮敬右遶。信受其語。如拘¹⁷欄荼華
¹⁸爲癡人所捉。迦葉。是名沙門拘¹⁹欄荼。

¹ A, M, S, Y: 拘 for 拘.

² The term 拘欄荼 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b10.

³ A, M, S, Y: 拘 for 拘.

⁴ A: 花 for 華.

⁵ A: 狠 for 貌.

⁶ A: 潔 for 好.

⁷ A: 體 for 體.

⁸ A: 鞞 for 韌.

⁹ A, G, J, K, M, S, Y: 臭 for 嗅.

¹⁰ A: 牟 for 觸.

¹¹ K: 嗅 for 嗅.

¹² M, S, Y: 拘 for 拘.

¹³ A: 獷 for 獷. The term 麤獷 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b11.

¹⁴ M, S, Y: 拘 for 拘.

¹⁵ A: omits 不.

¹⁶ A: 已 for 以.

¹⁷ M, S, Y: 拘 for 拘.

¹⁸ A: 花 for 華.

III.11

A 72, J 162a17, K 887b3, T 642a8:

迦葉。云何沙門求¹利。迦葉。譬如諛²諂之人心常慳惜爲貪所覆若見他財物惴³望欲得。畜利刀杖⁴。無慚愧心。無哀愍⁵心。常有害心。若行空澤山林聚落發如是心於他財物希⁶求欲得。常自藏身不令他見。迦葉。如是沙門求⁷利。心常慳惜爲貪所覆。於所得利心無知足。於他財物⁸惴⁹望¹⁰欲得¹¹。有所至¹²處聚落城邑¹³常爲利養不爲善法。覆藏諸惡。謂¹⁴。善比丘知我破戒。知已若說戒¹⁵時或¹⁶驅¹⁷我出於善比丘。但¹⁸生恐懼心。常諛¹⁹

¹⁹ M, S, Y: 拘 for 构.

¹ A: 朱 for 求.

² A: 論 for 諛.

³ J: 希 for 惴.

⁴ A: 放 for 杖. G, J, M, S, Y: 仗 for 杖.

⁵ F: 愍念 for 哀愍.

⁶ A: 惴 for 希.

⁷ A: 朱 for 求.

⁸ A: 利 for 物.

⁹ J: 希 for 惴.

¹⁰ A: 注 for 望.

¹¹ A: 渴 for 得.

¹² A: omits 至.

¹³ A: inserts 城邑.

¹⁴ A: 諸 for 謂.

¹⁵ A: 我 for 戒.

¹⁶ A: 戒 for 或.

¹⁷ J: 驅 for 驅.

¹⁸ A, C, F: 恒 for 但.

¹⁹ A: 論 for 諛.

諂現行儀式。一切天龍鬼神有天眼者。知此比丘來時賊來。去時賊去。行時賊行。坐時賊坐。臥時賊臥¹。取衣時賊取衣。著衣時賊著衣。入聚落時賊入聚落。出聚落時賊出²聚落。食時賊食。飲時賊飲³。剃髮時賊剃髮。

III.12

A 86, J 162b2, K 887b20, T 642a22:

迦葉。如是癡人去來儀式皆爲天龍鬼神之所知見。見已訶罵。如此惡人即爲壞滅釋迦牟尼佛法。作是訶責⁴諸惡比丘。又彼諸天龍鬼神見持戒梵行沙門婆羅門。增益信心。禮敬⁵尊重此人於佛法中應受利養者。迦葉。此沙門求⁶利於佛法中出家不能生一念寂⁷滅離欲之心。況得沙門果。若有得者。無有是處。迦葉。是名沙門求⁸利。

III.13

A 94, J 162b1, K 887c6, T 642b1:

迦葉。云何稗沙門。迦葉。譬如麥⁹田中生稗¹⁰麥。其形似麥不

¹ A: omits 時賊臥. J, M, N, Q, Y insert: 起時賊起, not in Tibetan.

² J: 世 for 出.

³ A: 欲 for 飲.

⁴ A: 憤 for 責.

⁵ A: 敬禮 for 禮敬.

⁶ A: 朱 for 求.

⁷ A: 家 for 寂?

⁸ A: 朱 for 求.

⁹ K: 麦 for 麥.

¹⁰ A: from line 95 to 116 has text of III.14-15 inserted; III.13 resumes at line 116. The term 生稗 is

可分別。爾時。田夫作如是念謂。此稗麥盡是好麥。後見稂¹
 生²爾乃知非。不得名言一切是麥。迦葉。如是稗沙門。在於衆
 中似是持戒有德行者。施主見時。謂盡是沙門。而彼癡人實非沙
 門言是沙門。非梵行人自言梵行。先來敗壞離於持戒。亦³不入
 衆數。於佛法中無智慧命⁴當墮惡道。猶如⁵稗麥在好麥中。⁶
 爾時。天龍鬼神有天眼者。見彼癡人墮於地獄。見已各相謂言。
 此是癡人先似沙門行不善法。今當墮於⁷大地獄中。從今已後終
 不能得沙門德行及沙門果。猶如稗麥在好麥中。迦葉。是名稗⁸
 沙門。

Compare the passage at 中阿含經 T. 26 (123) (I) 611b9-20:

猶如居士有良稻田或有麥田生草名穢麥。其根相似莖節葉花皆亦似
 麥。後生實已居士見之便作是念。是麥污辱是麥憎刺。知已便拔擲
 棄於外。所以者何。莫令污穢餘真好麥。如是。大目犍連。或有癡
 人正知出入。善觀分別屈伸低仰儀容庠序。善著僧伽梨及諸衣鉢行
 住坐臥眠寤語默皆正知之。似如真梵行至諸真梵行所彼或不知。大
 目犍連。若諸梵行知者便作是念。是沙門污。是沙門辱。是沙門憎。
 是沙門刺。知已便當共擯棄之。所以者何。莫令污染諸梵行者。

Compare also 四分律 T. 1428 (XXII) 1009c4-11:

quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b12.

¹ M, Q: 稂 for 稂.

² The term 稂生 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b13.

³ A: omits 亦.

⁴ A: inserts 終.

⁵ A: omits 如.

⁶ A: splits its paragraphing here.

⁷ A: omits 於.

⁸ A: inserts 麥.

譬如農夫田苗稊稗參生苗葉相類不別。而爲妨害乃至莠實。方知非穀之異既知非穀既耘除根本。何以故。恐害善苗故。比丘亦復如是。有惡比丘行來坐起攝持衣鉢。如善比丘不別乃至不出罪。時既出其罪。方知比丘中稊稗之異。既知其異應和合爲作滅擯除之。何以故。恐妨善比丘故。

III.14

A 128, J 162b22, K 887c21, T 642b14:

迦葉。云何蒲¹生²沙門。迦葉。譬如蒲生稻苗以不熟故名³爲蒲生。以無實故。風所吹去無堅重力。似稻非稻。迦葉。如是蒲生沙門形似沙門。無人教呵⁴。無有德力爲魔風所吹。亦無血氣持戒之力。離於多聞。損失定力。亦遠於智。不能破壞諸煩惱⁵賊。名如是人輕劣⁶無力。繫屬於魔。爲魔所鉤⁷。沒在一切煩惱⁸之中。爲魔風所吹如蒲生稻。迦葉。蒲生之稻不中爲種⁹。亦¹⁰不生牙¹¹。迦葉。如是蒲生沙門。於佛法中無道種子。於賢

¹ I have accepted the reading of M and Q, 蒲, for the 通 of all other editions, here and in the following. I believe the latter is meaningless.

² The term 通生 is quoted and defined by the *Xuanying yiqiejing yinyi* 玄應一切經音義 (Zhou 1963: 396.6-397.3) as follows: 補胡反宜作稽力舉反謂田中不種自生禾豆者爲稽生也。 It is also quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b14.

³ A: omits 名.

⁴ A: 訶 for 呵.

⁵ A: 惚 for 惱.

⁶ A: 易 for 劣?

⁷ M, Y: 拘 for 鉤.

⁸ A: 惚 for 惱.

⁹ A: omits 種.

¹⁰ A: inserts 稻.

¹¹ J: 芽 for 牙. A omits 牙.

¹聖法中不得解脫。迦葉。蒲生沙門者。所謂。破戒行²惡是名蒲生沙門。

Compare 四分律 T. 1428 (XXIII) 1009c11-16:

譬如農夫治穀當風簸揚好穀留聚其下秕荳隨風除之。何以故。恐污好穀故。如是惡比丘行來入出。如善比丘不別乃至不出罪。時既出其罪方知比丘中秕荳穢惡既知已。應和合爲作滅擯除之。

III.15

A 95, J 162c3, K 888a11, T 642b25:

迦葉。云何³似沙門。迦葉。譬如巧工以金塗銅。其色似金。價⁴不同金。若揩磨時乃知非金。迦葉。如是⁵似沙門者。好自嚴飾⁶。常澡浴身。齊整⁷著衣。沙門儀式一切具足。去來屈伸⁸常正⁹儀式。而彼常爲貪恚癡所害。亦爲利養禮敬讚歎¹⁰所害。亦爲我¹¹慢增上慢一切煩惱¹²所害。雖爲人所貴無貴重法。常勤¹³嚴身。悌望飲食不求聖法。不畏後世。現見尊¹⁴重非將來

-
- 1 A, F: omit 賢.
 2 A: omits 戒行.
 3 J, M, N, Q, Y: insert: 形.
 4 A: 賈 for 價.
 5 M inserts: 形.
 6 A: 飭 for 飾.
 7 A: 政 for 整.
 8 A, J: 申 for 伸.
 9 A: 政 for 正.
 10 A: 嘆 for 歎.
 11 A: omits 我.
 12 A: 惚 for 惱.
 13 A: 勸 for 勤.
 14 A: omits 尊.

尊重。但長肌肥¹ 依於利養非依於法。種種繫縛勤²。作家業
順³ 在家心。亦隨所⁴ 受苦時受苦。樂時受樂。爲愛憎所⁵ 害。
於沙門法無心欲行。離諸儀式。必當墮於地獄餓鬼畜生。彼人無
沙門賈⁶。無沙門稱。不與沙門等。迦葉。是名⁷ 似沙門。

III.16

A 108, J 162c16, K 888b4, T 642c9:

迦葉。云何失沙門血⁸ 氣。迦葉。譬如男子。若⁹ 女人。若童男。
若童女非人飲¹⁰ 其血氣。彼人羸瘦無有色力由失血氣故。迦葉。
如是之人失血氣故。諸藥呪術及諸刀杖¹¹ 所不能治必至於死。迦
葉。如是沙門無有持戒定慧解脫解脫知見血氣及慈悲¹² 喜捨血氣。
亦無¹³ 行施調伏護身口意業¹⁴ 血氣。亦無安住四聖種血氣。無有

¹ The term 肌肥 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b15.

² A: 慙 for 勤.

³ A: 業煥 for 業順.

⁴ Reading with A, J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z, against C, F, K, T, which omit 所.

⁵ A: 受所增 for 愛憎所. C: 增 for 憎.

⁶ Only A reads 賈, all other editions reading 實. Tibetan *rin thang* or *ri ba* confirms that 賈 is correct.

⁷ M, Y insert: 形.

⁸ A: 面 written almost exactly like 血, and so below as well.

⁹ A: omits 若.

¹⁰ A, C, G, J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 食 for 飲.

¹¹ J, M, S, Y: 仗 for 杖.

¹² A: 非 for 悲.

¹³ A: 不 for 無.

¹⁴ A: omits 業.

儀式血氣。亦無¹淨身²口意血氣。迦葉。是名沙門失於血氣。

III.17

A 138, J 162c24, K 888b14, T 642c17:

迦葉。如失血氣沙門。雖受如來法藥。不以自度。法藥者所謂

- (1) 若起婬欲應觀不淨。
- (2) 若起瞋恚應行慈心。
- (3) 若起愚癡應³觀十二因緣。
- (4) 於諸煩惱⁴應正⁵思惟。
- (5) 離於樂衆。
- (6) 捨我所有。
- (7) 出家三事應當愛⁶護。三事者所謂。持戒清淨。其心調伏。入定不亂。

迦葉。如是法藥我之所說我所聽服。雖受此藥不以自度。

III.18

A 145, J 163a1, K 888b22, T 642c24:

迦葉。又有⁷出世法。所謂。空觀⁸無相無作觀。陰界入。知四

-
- ¹ A: displacement of text; skip from line 116 to 138.
 - ² A: omits 身.
 - ³ A: 應 inserted small, between two characters.
 - ⁴ A: 慙 for 惱.
 - ⁵ A: omits 正.
 - ⁶ A: 受 for 愛.
 - ⁷ A: 有又 for 又有.
 - ⁸ A, F: omit 觀.

聖諦及十二因¹緣。迦葉。如是法藥彼人亦復不以自度。迦葉。
如是沙門臭穢不淨以破戒故。薄福德故生極下處。以憍慢故於此
命終不生餘處必當墮在大地獄中。如人失於血氣必定至死。如是
沙門於此命終必墮地獄。迦葉。是名失²血氣沙門。

III.19

A 152, J 163a7, K 888c7, T 643a2:

如是說已。五百比丘捨戒還俗。爾時。有諸比丘呵彼比丘言。若
大德於佛法中退還家者。如是非善。如是非法。

III.20

A 154, J 163a10, K 888c10, T 643a4:

佛告諸比丘。莫作是語。何以故。若如是者名爲順法。若比丘不
欲受人信施退還家者是名順法。彼諸比丘信解心多故生悔心。說
此語時。彼得聞已作如是念。我等或能行不淨行受他信施。應生
悔心退而還家。迦葉。我今說此諸比丘等於此命終生兜率天彌勒
菩薩所。彌勒如來出於世時。彼諸比丘在初會數中³。

¹ A: omits 因.

² A: omits 失.

³ A: omits 中.

營事比丘品

第四

IV.1

A 163, J 163a19, K 888c21, T 643a13:

爾時。摩訶迦葉白佛言。世尊。云何比丘能營衆事。佛告。迦葉。我聽二種比丘得營衆事。何等二。一者。能淨¹持戒。二者。畏於後世喻如金剛。復有二種。何等二²。一者。識知業報。二者。有諸慚愧及以悔心。復有二種。何等二³。一者。阿羅漢。二者。能修八背捨者。迦葉。如是二種比丘。我聽營事自無瘡⁴疣⁵。

四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 T. 1804 (XL) 55b12-18 [containing also the first few words of section IV.2]:

寶梁大集等經云。僧物難掌佛法無主。我聽二種人掌三寶物。一。阿羅漢。二。須陀洹。所以爾者。諸餘比丘戒不具足。心不平等。不令是人爲知事也。更復二種。一。能淨持戒識知業報。二。畏後世罪。有諸慚愧及以悔心。如是二人。自無瘡疣。護他人意。此事甚難。 Note however the passage in T. 397 (XIII) 238c27-239a2, the *Sūryagarbhasūtra* 日藏分護持正法品 of the *Mahāsaṃnipāta* 大方等大集經: 佛言大王。有二種人堪持僧事守護僧物。何者爲二。一者。具八解脫阿羅漢。二者。須陀洹等三果學人。此二種人堪知僧事供養衆僧。諸餘比丘。或戒不具足。心不平等。不令是人爲知僧事。

梵網經菩薩戒本疏 T. 1813 (XL) 616c12-17:

¹ A: omits 淨.

² A: omits 何等二.

³ A: omits 何等二.

⁴ A, G: 創 for 瘡.

⁵ The term 創疣 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b16.

寶梁經上卷。佛告。迦葉。我聽二種比丘得營衆事。何等爲二。一者。能持戒。二者。畏於後世喻若金剛。復有二種。一者。識知業報。二者。有諸慚愧及以悔心。復有二種。一者。阿羅漢。二者。能修八背捨者。迦葉。如是二種比丘。我聽營事自無瘡疣。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844b2-7 (compare T. 2123):

又寶梁經云。佛告。迦葉。我聽二種比丘得營衆事。何等爲二。一。能淨持戒。二。畏於後世喻如金剛。復有二種。何等爲二。一。識知業報。二。有諸慚愧及以悔心。復有二種。何等爲二。一。阿羅漢。二。能修八背捨者。如是二種比丘。我聽營事自無瘡疣。

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 131a7-13, precisely the same as T. 2122.

釋氏要覽 T. 2127 (LIV) 302c12-15 [containing also the first few words of section IV.2]:

營事比丘。寶積經云。佛言。我許二種比丘營事。一。能持戒。二。思 [misprint, 思 for 畏?] 於後世。又二人。一。知識業報。二。有諸慚愧及悔心。如是人等。營衆事自無瘡疣。護他意此事難故。

IV.2

A 169, J 163a25, K 889a5, T 643a19:

何以故。迦葉。護他人意此事¹難故。迦葉。於佛法中種種出家
種種性種種心種種解脫種種斷結。或有阿蘭若。或有乞食。或有
樂住山林。或有樂近²聚落清淨持戒。或有能離四扼³。或有
勤⁴修多聞。或有辯⁵說諸法。或有善持戒律。或有善持毘尼儀

¹ A: omits 事.

² A: 住 for 近.

³ C, F, G, J, M, S, Y: 扼 for 扼, and so for 扼 below. N, Q, Z?

⁴ A: 能勤 for 勤.

⁵ A: 辯 for 辯?

式¹。或有遊諸城邑聚落爲人說法。有如是等諸²比丘僧。營事比丘善取如是諸人心相。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86a23-24:

如寶積經說。佛言。營事比丘於諸比丘衆應護持是心。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844b7-14 (Compare T. 2123.):

能護他人意以此事難故語。迦葉。於佛法中種種出家種種姓種種心種種解脫種種斷結。或有阿蘭若。或有乞食。或有樂住山林。或有樂近聚落清淨持戒。或有能離四扼。或有勤修多聞。或有辯說諸法。或有善持戒律。或有善持毘尼儀式。或有游諸城邑聚落爲人說法。有如是等諸比丘僧。營事比丘善取如是諸人心相。

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 131a13-20:

Identical with T. 2122, except 遊 for 游, and final 想 for 相。

IV.3

A 176, J 163b2, K 889a14, T 643a27:

迦葉。若阿蘭若比丘樂空閑處。營事比丘一切役使不應令作。有時阿蘭若比丘在比丘僧次役使而營事比丘應當代作。若自不作應倩他³人令代爲之。不應役使阿蘭若比丘。若非行道時可少令作。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86a24-28:

若阿蘭若比丘樂空寂處坐。彼營事比丘於一切時處不應役使。時阿蘭若比丘設入衆學處而得役使。是營事比丘應代彼作。或別請比丘代彼阿蘭若比丘作故。

¹ A: omits 式.

² A: omits 諸.

³ The term 倩他 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b17.

IV.4

A 180, J 163b7, K 889a20, T 643b2:

迦葉。若有乞食比丘。彼營事比丘於乞食比丘¹應與好食。若有比丘能離四扼²營事比丘隨所須物應當供給。所謂³。衣服飲食臥具醫藥。若離扼比丘所住之處。營事比丘於其住處不應高聲大喚亦不令他⁴高聲大喚。欲防護離扼比丘故。營事比丘於離扼比丘應生尊敬如世⁵尊想⁶。生如是念。如是比丘於佛法中能作法柱⁷當隨所須而供給之。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86a28-b5:

若有行乞食比丘。彼營事比丘應與美膳而供給之。復次。迦葉。若有比丘得離扼者。彼營事比丘隨其所須一切給與。所謂。飲食衣服臥具醫藥。若離扼比丘所住之處。不應高聲。彼營事比丘於離扼比丘所。近住坐臥爲作防護。隨其所樂上妙飲膳而供給之。

IV.5

A 188, J 163b15, K 889b6, T 643b10:

迦葉。若有勤⁸修多聞比丘。營事比丘應當勸喻作如是言。大德。勤修多聞讀誦令利。我當爲諸大德供給使令。若諸大德勤修多聞。於比丘僧中是好瓔珞⁹能昇高座¹⁰。廣¹¹說正法亦自生智慧。營

-
- 1 A: omits 彼營事比丘於乞食比丘.
 2 A: 振 for 扼.
 3 A: 須 for 謂.
 4 A: inserts 人.
 5 A: 聖 for 世.
 6 A: repeats 尊想.
 7 A: omits 柱.
 8 A: 慇 for 勤, and so in the following as well.
 9 J: 纓絡 for 瓔珞.

事比丘不應非時役使。應當擁護令修多聞。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86b5-6:

又云。若有多聞比丘應當勇悍。乃至。守護。

IV.6

A 193, J 163b20, K 889b13, T 643b15:

迦葉。若有說法比丘。營事比丘應事事供給。應將說法比丘。至城邑聚落。勸喻諸人令就聽法。說法之處亦應供給爲說法人敷好高座¹。若有比丘強自以力欲壞說法者²。營事比丘應往和解。

亦應數往說法人所稱及³言。善哉。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86b6-8:

若有說法比丘。應當爲法。乃至。就座聽法住法會處或論議場清淨之處。乃至。應當三唱善哉。以要言之。

IV.7

A 198, J 163b25, K 889b19, T 643b20:

迦葉。若有比丘善持戒律。善持毘尼義。營事比丘應往其所數數問義。我云何營事令不得罪。自無所損。不害於他⁴。持毘尼義比丘應觀營事者心。隨所營事而爲說法。所謂。是應作。是不應作。

¹⁰

A: 坐 for 座.

¹¹

A: 演 for 廣.

¹

A: 坐 for 座.

²

A: omits 者.

³

A, K: omit 及.

⁴

A: 他施 for 於他.

IV.8

A 202, J 163b29, K 889c1, T 643b25:

營事比丘於持律人所一心生信禮敬供養。若比丘僧所有分物應當
 隨¹時供給。於僧不應藏舉隨僧所須。應當分與。應與時²與。
 不惡心與。不以非法與。非欲心與。非瞋心與。非癡心與。³非
 畏心與。

IV.9

A 206, J 163c4, K 889c6, T 643b29:

隨僧法行非隨在家行。隨僧制行非自隨制行。不於僧物生自在想
 乃至小事。與僧共斷非自在斷。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86b8-9:

不應於所有物起自在想。設少有辦事衆許方作。勿自許用。乃至。

IV.10

A 209, J 163c6, K 889c9, T 643c2:

若所用物。所謂。常住僧物。及與佛物。若招提僧物。彼營事比
 丘應當分別。常住僧物不應與招提僧。招提僧物不應與常住僧。
 常住僧物不應⁴與招提僧物共雜。招提僧物不⁵與常住僧物共雜。
 常住僧物招提僧物不與佛物共雜。佛物不與常住僧物招提僧物共

¹ G, S, Y, Z: insert 三.² A: 時時 for 與時.³ A: inserts 不.⁴ A: omits 應.⁵ M, Q: insert 應.

雜。若常住僧物多而招提僧有所須者。營事比丘應集僧行籌索欲。

若僧和合。應以常住僧物分與招提僧。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86b9-12:

現前僧物四方僧物不相提聚。及佛塔物更互積聚。應善遮防如是顛倒。若四方僧物與現前僧物互有疑濫。

四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 T. 1804 (XL) 56b4-7 (compare T. 2122):

寶梁等經云。佛法二物不得互用。由無有人爲佛法物作主故。復無可咨白不同僧物。所以常住招提互有所須。

梵網經菩薩戒本疏 T. 1813 (XL) 615a16-19:

又准寶梁經云。佛法二物不得互用。由無能與佛法物作主。復無處可諮白不同僧物。常住招提互有所須。

梵網經古迹記 T. 1815 (XL) 704a26-29:

寶梁經云。佛法二物不得互用。於佛法物無有主故。復無可白不同僧物。常住招提互有所用。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 751c6-8 and (with 如 for 又 and 諮 for 須)

843c19-21 (compare T. 1804, T. 2123):

又寶梁寶印經云。佛法二物不得互用。由無與佛法物作主。復無可諮白不同僧物。常住招提互有所須。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844b14-20 (compare T. 2123):

故經云。彼營事比丘應當分別。常住僧物不得與招提僧。招提僧物不得與常住僧。[small character note: 此二種物不得互用] 常住僧物招提僧物不應與佛物共雜。[small character note: 佛物亦不得與二共雜] 若常住僧物多而招提僧有所須者。營事比丘應集僧行籌索欲。僧和合者。應以常住僧物分與招提僧。

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 130b24-26, quotes as 寶印經, otherwise identical with T. 2122 (LIII) 843c19-21 with 諮 for final 須, and 131a20-26, identical with T. 2122 844b14-20, except second small character note has 二物 for 二.

梵網戒本疏日珠鈔 T. 2247 (LXII) 94b15-16:

何故寶梁上卷云。常住僧物不與招提僧物雜。以其常住即四方故。

選擇傳弘決疑鈔 T. 2610 (LXXXIII) 82b28-c3: This seems to be an allusion to the *Ratnarāṣi*:

寶積經說。樂於世業營於衆務云云。世業衆務名諸餘業。何言雜行。答。餘業之言正在雜行。世業亦障專修行故顯其意耳。況寶積經亦見造塔等事善云衆務耶云云。

IV.11

A 217, J 163c14, K 889c19, T 643c11:

迦葉。若如來塔。或有所須若欲¹敗壞者。若常住僧物若招提僧物多。營事比丘應集僧行籌索欲作如是言。是佛塔壞。今有所須此常住僧物招提僧物多。大德僧聽。若僧時到僧忍聽。若僧不惜²。所得施物若常住僧物若招提僧物。我今持用修治³佛塔。若僧和合營事比丘⁴應以僧物修治佛塔。若僧不和合營事比丘應餘勸化在家人輩求索財物修治佛塔。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86b12-14:

彼營事比丘應白衆言。此現前僧及四方僧利養事。應同意施作如是佛塔朽壞。應求施者而爲興作。是佛教勅。

四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 T. 1804 (XL) 56b7-9 (compare T. 2122):

營事比丘和僧索欲行籌。和合者得用。若欲用僧物修治佛塔依法取僧和合得用。不和合者勸俗修補。

¹ A: omits 欲.

² A: 惜 for 惜.

³ The term 修治 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b18.

⁴ A: 皆立 for 比丘.

梵網經菩薩戒本疏 T. 1813 (XL) 615a19-21:

營事比丘和僧索欲行籌。和合者得用。若用僧物修治佛塔依法取僧和合得用。不和合者勸俗人修治。

梵網經古述記 T. 1815 (XL) 704a29-b1:

營事比丘和僧得用。若用僧物修治佛塔。僧若不和勸俗修理。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 751b20-22 (compare T. 1813, T. 1815):

寶印經云。若用僧物修治佛塔依法取僧和合得用。不和合者勸俗修治。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 751c8-9 (compare T. 1804):

營事比丘和僧索欲行籌。和合者得用。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 843c21-22 (compare T. 1804, T. 2123):

若用僧物修治佛塔者。依法取僧和合得用。不和合者勸俗修治。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844b20-27 (compare T. 2123):

若如來塔。或有所須若欲敗壞者。若常住僧物若招提僧物多。營事比丘應集僧行籌索欲作如是言。是佛塔壞。今有所須此常住僧物招提僧物多。大德僧聽。若僧時到僧忍聽。若僧不惜。所得施物若常住僧物招提僧物。我今持用修治佛塔。若僧不和合營事比丘應勸化在家人求索財物修治佛塔。

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 130b26-28 identical to T. 2122 (LIII) 843c21-22, and 131a26-b3, identical to T. 2122 (LIII) 844b20-27.

IV.12

A 225, J 163c22, K 890a6, T 643c19:

迦葉。若佛物¹多者。營事比丘不得以佛²物分與常住僧及招提僧。何以故。於此物³中應生世尊想。佛所有物乃至一線⁴皆是

¹ A: omits 物.

² A: 此 for 佛.

³ A: omits 物.

⁴ A: 綫 for 線.

施主信心施佛。是故諸天世人於此物中生佛塔想而況¹寶物。²
 若於佛塔先以衣施。此衣於佛³塔中寧令風吹雨爛破盡。不應以
 此衣貿⁴易寶物。何以故。如來塔物無人能與作價⁵者。又佛⁶
 無所須故。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86b14-21:

復次迦葉。若佛塔物多。彼營事比丘不應分與現前僧及四方僧。所以者何。以佛塔物下至十分之一。皆是淨信。何得多取。諸天世人生佛塔想。況復珠寶皆即寶故。若取佛塔衣於如來制底。寧使風雨曝爛散滅。不應以寶貿易此衣。如來塔衣無有人能善作價者。又佛無所須故。

四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 T. 1804 (XL) 56b9-12:

若佛塔有物乃至一錢以施主重心故捨。諸天及人於此物中應生佛想塔想。乃至。風吹雨爛。不得貿寶供養。以如來塔物無人作價故。

梵網經菩薩戒本疏 T. 1813 (XL) 615a21-24 (almost identical with T. 1804):

若佛塔有物乃至一錢以施主重心故捨。諸天及人於此物中應生佛想塔想。乃至。風吹雨爛。不得貨寶供養。以如來塔物無人作價。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 843c23-26 (compare T. 2123):

若佛塔有物乃至一錢已上以施主重心故捨。諸天及人於此物中應生佛想塔想。乃至。風吹爛壞。不得貿寶供養。以如來塔物無人作價也。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844b26-c4 (compare T. 2123):

¹ G: inserts 三.

² A: inserts 若似寶物.

³ A: omits 佛.

⁴ K: 賀 for 貿.

⁵ A: 賈 for 價.

⁶ A: inserts 亦.

若佛物多者。不得分與常住僧。何以故。於此物中應生世尊想。佛所有物乃至一線皆是施主信心施佛。是故諸天世人於此物中生佛塔想而況寶物。若於佛塔中寧令風吹雨爛破盡。不應以此衣貿易寶物。何以故。如來塔物無人能與作價者。又佛無所須故。

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 130b28-c2, identical with T. 2122 (LIII) 843c22-26, and 131b3-9, identical with T. 2122 (LIII) 844b26-c4.

梵網戒本疏日珠鈔 T. 2247 (LXII) 95b16-18:

如前寶梁經說者即前引云。若佛有物乃至一錢以施主重心故捨。諸天及人於此物中應生佛想塔想等文也。

IV.13

A 232, J 163c29, K 890a15, T 643c26:

迦葉。有如是善淨。營事人者。三寶之物不應令雜¹。又於自利養心常知足²。三寶物中不生我所有想。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844c4-6 (compare T. 2123; conflation with IV.18, below?):

如是營事人者。三寶之物不應令雜。以自離用得大苦報若受一劫若過一劫。以侵三寶物故。

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 131b10-12, identical with T. 2122.

IV.14

A 235, J 164a2, K 890a17, T 643c28:

迦葉。營事比丘若生瞋心而³於持戒大德人所右邊禮敬之者。以自在故驅⁴令役使。是故⁵營事比丘以瞋心緣故。墮大地獄。若

¹ A: 離 for 雜.

² A: 如是 for 知足.

³ A: omits 而.

⁴ J: 駟 for 驅.

得爲人作他奴僕¹。常爲其主苦驅²役使。人所鞭打³。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86b21-24:

佛言。迦葉。若營事比丘以惡心故。於持戒者爲手供給自在役使。以不善業墮大地獄。設得爲人作世奴僕希求財利。爲他役使毀罵打撲。以要言之。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844c6-9 (compare T. 2123):

又寶梁經云。佛言。營事比丘若生瞋心於持戒大德人所以自在故驅令役使。故墮地獄。若得爲人作奴僕爲主苦人所鞭打。

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 131b13-15, identical with T. 2122.

IV.15

A 239, J 164a6, K 890a22, T 644a3:

復次迦葉。若營事比丘以自在故。更作重制。過僧常限謫罰⁴比丘。非時令作。是營事比丘以此不善根故。墮於多釘小地獄中。生此中已。以百千釘釘挖⁵其身。其身熾然出大火焰⁶如大火聚。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86b24-27:

或於比丘更作新制。恐畏謫罰。非時役使。是營事比丘以不善根墮大地獄名曰多釘。乃至千釘釘身熾然猛焰成大火聚。又總略云。

⁵ A, F: omit 故.

¹ A: 僕 for 僕.

² J: 駟 for 驅.

³ The term 鞭打 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b19.

⁴ The term 謫罰 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b20.

⁵ The term 釘挖 is quoted and defined in the *Xuanying yiqiejing yinyi* 玄應一切經音義 (Zhou 1963: 396.6-397.3) as follows: 釘磔。竹格反。說文磔張也。開也。經文作挖俗字也。 The *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 also has the term (T. 2128 [LIV] 400b21): 釘磔。張革反。據經合是磔字。今經中書挖字。諸字書並無此字未詳其音。且書磔字也。

⁶ A: 炎 for 焰.

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844c9-12 (Compare T. 2123):

又營事比丘以自在故。更作重制。過僧常限謫罰比丘。非時令作。
以此不善根故。墮於多釘小地獄中。生此中已。以百千釘釘挖其身。
其身熾然如火聚。

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 131b15-19, identical with T. 2122.

IV.16

A 243, J 164a10, K 890b4, T 644a7:

若於¹持戒有大德者。以重事怖²之以瞋心語故。彼營事比丘生
地獄中。其所得舌長五³百由旬以百千⁴釘而釘其舌一一釘中出
大火焰⁵。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86b27-29:

其舌廣長百由旬量。於舌根上每百千釘熾然猛火。難堪難忍。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844c12-15 (Compare T. 2123):

又營事比丘於持戒有大德所。以重事怖之以瞋心語故。生地獄中。
其所得舌長五百由旬以百千釘而釘其舌一一釘中出大火焰。

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 131b19-22, identical with T. 2122.

IV.17

A 246, J 164a13, K 890b8, T 644a11:

迦葉。若營事比丘數得僧物慳惜藏舉。或非時與僧。或⁶復難與。

-
- ¹ A: omits 於.
² A: 付 for 怖.
³ A: omits 五.
⁴ A: omits 千.
⁵ A: 炎 for 焰. F: 焔 for 焰.
⁶ A: omits 或.

或困苦與。或少與或不與。或有與者或不與者¹。營事比丘以此不善根故。墮²穢惡餓鬼常食糞丸³。此人命終當生是中。爾時。更有餓鬼以食示之而復不與。此鬼爾時悵望欲得諦視此食目不⁴曾瞬。受飢渴苦。於百⁵千歲中常不得食。或時得食變爲糞屎或作膿血。何以故。有持戒人人所敬禮僧所有物以自在故而難與之。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 86b29-c6:

佛言。迦葉。又營事比丘若來若去。得僧利養慳惜拘藏。或應時不時與或困苦與。乃至。不與。是營事比丘以不善根故。死墮餓鬼名食糞丸。有大力鬼持以示之。初不得近。然於糞丸仰目諦視。受飢渴苦經百千歲。於其飲食了不可得。設有少得。由險惡行悉成糞穢。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844c15-20 (compare T. 2123):

又。營事比丘數得僧物慳惜藏舉。或非時與僧。或復難與或困苦與。或少與或不與。或有與者。或不與者。以此不善根故。有[reading of A!] 穢惡餓鬼常食糞丸。此人命終當生是中。於百千歲中常不得食。或時得食變爲糞屎或作膿血。

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 131b22-27, identical with T. 2122, except for the omission of 中常.

IV.18

A 254, J 164a22, K 890b19, T 644a19:

迦葉。若營事比丘以常住僧物若招提僧物及以佛物輒⁶自雜用。

¹ A: omits 或不與者.

² A: 有 for 墮. Note that this reading is confirmed by the quotation in T. 2122.

³ The term 糞丸 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b22.

⁴ T: 下 for 不, evidently a misprint (see Nagai 1932: 238, note 20).

⁵ A: omits 百.

⁶ A, J, K: 輒 for 輒.

得大苦報。若受一劫。若過一劫¹。何以故。以侵三寶物故。

See the quotations cited above under IV.13.

IV.19

A 256, J 164a24, K 890b22, T 644a22:

迦葉。若營事比丘聞如是罪。知如是罪²。而故生瞋心於³持戒者。我今說此諸佛世尊所不能治。迦葉。是故營事比丘聞如是非法罪已。應當善護身口意業。自護亦護他⁴。

IV.20

A 260, J 164a28, K 890c3, T 644a26:

迦葉。營事比丘。寧自噉身肉。終不雜用⁵三寶之物作衣鉢飲食。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 843b10-11:

又寶梁經云。寧噉身肉終不得用三寶之物。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 844c20-22, verbatim quotation, with the addition of 是故 before the sentence.

諸經要集 T. 2123 (LIV) 131b27-28, identical with T. 2122 (LIII) 844c20-22 here, and with (LIII) 843b10-11 at T. 2132 (LIV) 130a16-17.

佛祖正傳禪戒鈔 T. 2601 (LXXXII) 649a10-11 of small type, verbatim beginning with 寶梁經云。寧, and so on.

¹ A: reads 切 instead of 劫若過一劫.

² A: omits 知如是罪.

³ A: omits 於.

⁴ A: inserts 人.

⁵ A: 用雜 for 雜用.

IV.21

A 261, B 1, J 164a29, K 890c5, T 644a27:

爾時。摩訶¹迦葉白佛言。世尊。未曾有也。如來自以慈²心說
如是法。爲無慚愧者說無慚愧法。有慚愧³者說慚愧法。⁴

¹ A: omits 摩訶.

² Dunhuang Manuscript Stein 5664 begins here with 慈. Its readings are given with the siglum B.

³ A: inserts 法.

⁴ Here the 113th *juan* of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* ends and the 114th begins. The title information given at the beginning of the *sūtra* is repeated here (and so in B as well). For details see Taishō page 644, notes 1-5. A ends here, and although now incomplete was of course originally the first of the two *juan* of the *sūtra*. *juan* 2 is not known to exist. C is not reproduced for *juan* 2 due to its poor condition.

阿¹ 蘭若比丘品

第五

V.1

B 4, J 164c5, K 891a4, T 644b10:

爾時。摩訶迦葉白佛言。世尊。若有比丘自言阿蘭若比丘。世尊。
齊幾² 所名阿蘭若比丘。齊幾所名乞食比丘。齊幾所名畜糞掃衣
比丘。齊幾所名樹下比丘。齊幾所名塚³ 間比丘。齊幾所名露處
比丘。

V.2

B 6, J 164c9, K 891a9, T 644b14:

佛告迦葉。阿蘭若比丘。必樂阿蘭若處。住阿蘭若處。迦葉。若
阿蘭若處。所謂。無大聲。無衆鬧聲。離羣鹿⁴ 虎狼及諸飛鳥。
遠諸賊盜及牧牛羊者。順沙門行處如⁵ 是阿蘭若處。應於中修行。

V.3

J 164c13, K 891a14, T 644b18:

彼比丘若欲至阿蘭若處。應當思惟八法。何等八。

¹ B: omits 阿.

² The term 齊幾 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400b24.

³ B, J: 冢 for 塚.

⁴ The term 羣鹿 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c1.

⁵ Apparently two pages or leaves or B are missing here (line 7 ends one leaf, line 8 begins the next), and the text skips to V.7 (13).

- 一者。我當捨身。
- 二者。應當捨命。
- 三者。當捨利養。
- 四者。離於一切所愛樂處。
- 五者。於山間死當如鹿死。
- 六者。阿蘭若處當受阿蘭若行。
- 七者。當以法自活。
- 八者。非以煩惱自活。

迦葉。是名八法。阿蘭若比丘所應思惟。思惟已當至阿蘭若處。

法苑珠林 T. 2122 (LIII) 904a14-18:

又寶梁經云。佛告。迦葉。比丘若欲至阿蘭若處。當思八法。何等爲八。一。我當捨身。二。應當捨命。三。當捨利養。四。離於一切所愛樂處。五。於山間死當如鹿死。六。阿蘭若處當受阿蘭若行。七。當以法自活。八。非以煩惱自活。

V.4

J 164c19, K 891a22, T 644b24:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘至阿蘭若處已。行阿蘭若法。以八行行慈。於一切衆生生慈心。何等八。

- 一者。以慈利益。
- 二者。以慈樂。
- 三者。無害慈。
- 四者。正慈。

五者。無異慈。

六者。順慈。

七者。觀一切法慈。。

八者。淨如虛空慈。

迦葉。以如是八行於諸衆生生慈心。

V.5

J 164c25, K 891b6, T 644c1:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘至阿蘭若處已。應如是思惟。我雖至遠處獨無伴侶。若我行善若行不善無人教呵。復作是念。此有諸天龍鬼神諸佛世尊知我專心。彼爲我證。我今在此行阿蘭若法。我不善心不得自在。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 115b27-c2:

彼經又說。復次阿蘭若行應發是心。然我至此阿蘭若處獨無伴侶。若我所起善作惡作。爾時。此有天龍藥叉佛世尊等知我深心。俱爲我證。又若住此阿蘭若中以心不善自在游逸。

V.6

J 164c29, K 891b12, T 644c5:

若我至此極遠之處。獨無伴侶無親近者。無我所有。我今當覺欲覺恚覺惱覺餘不善法亦應當覺。我今不應不異於樂衆者。亦不應不異近聚落人。若如是不異。我即爲誑諸天龍鬼神已。諸佛見

我¹亦不歡悅。我今若如阿蘭若法。則諸天龍鬼神不見呵責。諸佛見我即亦歡悅。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 115c2-7:

又若至此極遠之處。獨無伴侶無親近者。無我無取。應如實覺。欲尋恚尋害尋及餘不善法尋。悉如實覺。若我於此不異其衆樂處有情慣鬧中者。即爲欺誑天龍藥叉諸佛世尊。若如所作天龍藥叉不爲呵厭。諸佛世尊悉皆歡喜。

V.7

B 8, J 165a6, K 891b19, T 644c12:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘。住阿蘭若處行阿蘭若法。

- (1) 一心堅持解脫禁戒。
- (2) 善護戒衆。
- (3) 淨身口意。
- (4) 無諛諂²行。
- (5) 淨於正命。
- (6) 心向諸定。
- (7) 如所聞法。
- (8) 應憶念之勤正思惟。
- (9) 趣向離欲寂滅涅槃。
- (10) 畏於生死。

¹ J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: insert: 我. This is unnecessary, as shown by Tibetan; it is the buddhas who are not pleased.

² The term 諛諂 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c2.

- (11) 觀五陰如怨家。
- (12) 觀四大如毒蛇。
- (13) 觀六入¹如空聚。
- (14) 善知方便。
- (15) 觀十二因緣。
- (16) 離斷常見。
- (17) 觀無衆生無我無人無命。
- (18) 解法空相。
- (19) 行於無相。
- (20) 漸捐所作而行無作。
- (21) 心常驚畏於三界行。
- (22) 常勤修行如救頭然。
- (23) 常行精進終不退轉。
- (24) 觀身實相。
- (25) 應生如是心觀如是法。
- (26) 當知苦本。
- (27) 斷一切集。
- (28) 證於滅盡。
- (29) 勤修於道。

¹

B resumes here at line 8 with 入.

- (30) 行於慈心安住四念處。
- (31) 離不善法入善法門。
- (32) 安住四正勤。
- (33) 入四如意足。
- (34) 護五善根。
- (35) 於五力中而得自在。
- (36) 覺七菩提分。
- (37) 勤行八聖善道分。
- (38) 受持禪定。
- (39) 以慧分別諸法之相。

V.8

B 12, J 165a20, K 891c14, T 644c26:

迦葉。說如是法以嚴飾。阿蘭若比丘作是嚴飾已住於山林。初夜後夜勤修諸行不應睡眠。常念欲得出世之法。

V.9

B 13, J 165a22, K 891c17, T 644c28:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘。凡所住處常修行道。不自嚴身及諸衣服。拾乾枯草以用敷坐自用坐具。離常住僧及招提僧物。於阿蘭若處衣服知足。趣得覆身。爲行聖道故。

V.10

B 15, J 165a26, K 891c21, T 645a3:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘。若爲乞食至城邑聚落。應作是念。我從阿蘭若處至是城邑聚落。若得食若不得¹ 心無憂喜。若不得食者。應生喜心念宿業報。我今當勤修習福業。又念如來乞食亦不² 得。

V.11

B 17, J 165a30, K 892a3, T 645a7:

彼阿蘭若比丘入於城邑聚落乞食。應以法莊嚴。法莊嚴已然後乞食。云何法莊嚴。若見適意色不應染著。見不適意色亦不生瞋。若聞適意聲不適意聲。若嗅³ 適意香不適意香。適意味不適意味。適意觸不適意觸。適意法不適意法。心無染著亦不生瞋。攝護根門諦視一尋調伏其心。本所思法不令離心。不以食污⁴ 心而行乞食。應次第乞食。若得食處不應生著⁵。不⁶ 得食處不應生瞋。若至十家若過十家不得食者。不應生憂。應作是心。此諸長者及婆羅門。多有諸緣不與我食。又此長者諸婆羅門乃至未曾生心念我。況與我食。迦葉。阿蘭若比丘若能如是於乞食中不生驚畏。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 99c26-100a7:

寶積經云。若比丘入於城邑聚落乞食。應以法莊嚴而行乞食。所以者何。謂若見可愛不可愛色。見已不應起違順意。如是可愛可愛聲

¹ J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: insert: 食.

² M, N, Q, Y: insert: 時. J: inserts 可.

³ B, J, K: 嗅 for 嗅.

⁴ B, J: 汗.

⁵ F, J, M, N, Q: 喜 for 著. The reading with 喜 is logical, but wrong as shown by Sanskrit *anunaya* (Tibetan *rjes su chags pa*).

⁶ B seems to be missing four leaves here after line 21, and the text skips to VI.2.

香味觸法。見已皆勿起違順意。攝護諸根使無散亂。諦視一尋先所思法不捨作意。不以食覆於心而行乞食。若得食處不生樂著。若不得處不起瞋害。若至十家若過十家不得食者。勿生憂惱。當發是心。此諸長者及婆羅門。多作事緣不施我食。乃至未曾攝受於彼。況施我食。如是行乞食者不生憂惱。

V.12

J 165b14, K 892a19, T 645a20:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘乞食時。若見衆生若男若女若童男童女乃至畜生。應於是中生慈悲心。我行如是精進作如是願。若衆生見我及與我食者。皆生天上。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100a7-9:

又乞食時。見諸衆生若男若女童男童女乃至畜生。起慈悲心。若諸衆生見我所作及施我食。皆生天趣。

V.13

J 165b17, K 892a23, T 645a24:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘。若得麤食若得細食。受是食已應觀四方。此村邑中誰貧窮者。當減此食以施與之。若見貧人所可乞食即分半與。若不見貧者應生是心。我眼所不見衆生。我所得食於中好者願施與之。我爲施主。彼爲受者。迦葉。阿蘭若比丘乞食。得受食已。持至阿蘭若處。淨洗手足。淨沙門儀式具一切淨法。如法取草已結加¹ 趺坐。坐已而食。心無愛著亦無貢高。無有瞋心無

¹

F, J, M, N, Q, S, Y: 跏 for 加.

濁亂心。臨欲食時如是思惟。今此身中有八萬戶蟲¹。蟲得此食皆悉安樂。我今以食攝此諸蟲。我得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提時。以法攝取。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100a9-18:

如其所得精麤飲食。受是食已遍觀四方。此城邑聚落貧窮之者。我以此食而分施之。若見貧者於所乞食而爲分與。若不見有是貧窮者亦發是心。以我真實徹眼境際所觀衆生。我所乞食於中上味願當施與。持此食已詣阿蘭若處行杜多者。淨洗手足。於沙門行具諸儀式。威力加持結跏趺座而飲食之。乃至欲食如是作意。此身中蟲有八萬戶。共得此食皆得安隱。我今以食攝受諸蟲。我得菩提復以法化。

V.14

J 165b29, K 892b15, T 645b7:

迦葉。又。時阿蘭若比丘。食或不足應作是念。我今身輕能修忍辱。斷除諸惡少大小便。得身輕已亦得心輕。又得少睡亦不起欲想。應作如是思惟。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100a18-20:

若復不足發如是心。若食少者。令我身輕。息除便利。斷諸過惡身心輕安。又少惛睡。乃至於所乞食。

V.15

J 165c2, K 892b19, T 645b10:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘。若乞食得多應生知足想。應於食中減取一搏置淨石上如是思惟。有諸鳥獸能噉食者。我以施之彼爲受者。

¹ J: 虫 for 蟲. Hereafter not noted.

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100a20-22:

若復多者。於食分量應行捨法。於所乞食發如是心。飛鳥鹿屬希求飲食。我當施彼。

V.16

J 165c5, K 892b22, T 645b13:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘。食已洗鉢漱¹口²洗手。淨滌³應器手拭令乾。舉僧伽梨。依⁴阿蘭若處行。不離本所思惟法相。

V.17

J 165c7, K 892c2, T 645b15:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘行阿蘭若行時。若是凡夫未得沙門果。或時虎狼來至其所。若見不應生畏。作如是念。我本來至阿蘭若處時已捨身命。我不應驚畏。應修慈心離一切惡亦離怖畏。若諸虎狼斷我命根噉我身肉。當生是念。我得大利以不堅身當得堅身。此諸虎狼我不與食。今噉我肉已身得安樂。迦葉。阿蘭若比丘行阿蘭若法。應如是捨身命。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 115b8-14:

寶積經云。復次。阿蘭若行若諸異生未得果者。見虎狼至勿生驚怖。當發是心。我本詣此阿蘭若處已捨身命。不應驚畏。爲起慈心遠離過失使無怖懼。又若虎狼斷我命根噉我身肉應起是心。我得善利以

¹ J: 漱 for 漱.

² The term 漱口 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c3.

³ The term 淨滌 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c4.

⁴ J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 依 for 依, probably attaching it to the previous clause. This is a *lectio facilior*, however, and is proved wrong by Tibetan *brten nas*, **āśritya*.

不堅身而當獲堅固。若復不能令噉我肉。豈彼虎狼得樂觸耶。以要言之。

V.18

J 165c15, K 892c11, T 645b23:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘行阿蘭若法。若有非人。或作好色或作惡色。

來至其所。於此非人不生愛心不生瞋心。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 115b14-15:

復次阿蘭若行。有非人來。若美若醜。不應愛樂。亦勿損害。

V.19

J 165c17, K 892c14, T 645b25:

迦葉。或有曾見佛諸天。來至阿蘭若所作諸問難。問難已。阿蘭若比丘。隨力所能隨所學法爲諸天說。或時諸天有深問難。阿蘭若比丘若不能答。不應生於憍慢之心。應作是言。我不多聞。汝莫輕我。我今當勤修學佛法。或時我得通佛法已能一切答。又應勸請諸天。汝等今當爲我說法。我當聽受。又應如是報謝言。願勿嫌也。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 115b15-21:

若有往昔見佛諸天。來此阿蘭若比丘所起諸問難時。彼比丘如力所能。隨所學法爲諸天說。又若有深問難時。阿蘭若比丘。或未能答而不生恭敬者應語彼言。我今未得無學。若我當勤佛教。時聞法已盡能通解答一切問。我今唯能得聞是法。乃至總略。

V.20

J 165c25, K 892c23, T 645c4:

復次迦葉。阿蘭若比丘行阿蘭若法。善修阿蘭若想。猶如草木瓦石。無主無我亦無所屬。此身亦爾。無我無命無人無衆生無諍訟。此法皆從緣合而生。於此法中若善思惟。我當得斷一切諸見。常應思惟空無相無作法。

V.21

J 165c30, K 893a6, T 645c9:

迦葉。阿蘭若比丘行阿蘭若法時。若草¹藥草及諸樹林。云何和合。云何散滅。如此外物無主無我。無有所亦無諍訟。自生自滅無生滅者。迦葉。如草木瓦石。無我無主亦無所屬。此身亦爾。無我無命無人無衆生無諍訟。從衆緣生緣離則滅。此如實中無有一法若生若滅。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 115b21-27:

若住阿蘭若處藥草樹林。尚不取著。云何爲生。何等爲滅。如是觀察。是身無我無主宰。無作者無受者。誰生誰滅。畢竟無有生滅之者。是身亦復如是。譬若草木牆壁瓦礫無我無主宰。無作者無受者。因緣和合故即生。因緣離散故即滅。復次。於勝義中無有一法是生是滅。

V.22

J 166a6, K 893a14, T 645c15:

迦葉。如是法阿蘭若比丘。至阿蘭若處所應修行。迦葉。阿蘭若比丘行如是法。若學聲聞乘疾得沙門果。若有障法現世不得沙門

¹ J, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 菓 for 草; M: 果 for 草. (In C, M also said to read 菓.)

果者。不過見一佛二佛三佛。必定得斷一切諸漏。若學菩薩乘。
現世得無生法忍。得無障法必見未來諸佛。疾成阿耨多羅三藐三
菩提。

V.23

J 166a12, K 893a21, T 645c21:

說此阿蘭若品時。有五百比丘。斷一切漏心得解脫。

乞食比丘品

第六

VI.1

J 166a15, K 893b1, T 645c24:

佛告迦葉。云何比丘乞食。迦葉。若有比丘先安住本誓。我依乞食出家。我今住先誓。彼比丘專念無有¹諛諂。離一切請食。離一切僧中供養堅自莊嚴。

VI.2

B 22, J 166a18, K 893b5, T 645c27:

乞食比丘於一切味中不應生好味想。又於上妙食中自勸其心生如是想²。我如旃陀羅。應淨身心。不應淨飲食。何以故。食好食已一切爲糞。臭穢不淨故。我不應求好食。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100a22-26:

又乞食比丘於諸味中不應生好味想。乃至如旃陀羅童子。應淨身心。不應淨食。何以故。食美食已一切皆爲臭惡不淨。是故我今不應求美食也。乃至。

VI.3

B 23, J 166a22, K 893b9, T 646a2:

如是調伏心已。若入城邑聚落次第乞食。不應生如是想。男子與我食非女人。女人與我食非男子。童男與我食非童女。童女與我

¹ F, J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 有無 for 無有.

² B resumes here at line 22 with 想, having skipped from V.11.

食非童男。應得細食非麤食。應得美食非不美食。¹應故與食非不故²。應易得食非不易。應速得食非不速。若入人村應得恭敬非不恭敬。應得新食非宿食。應得富家食非貧家食。男子女人衆應來迎我。迦葉。乞食比丘如是不善法不應思惟。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100a26-b2:

不起是心。謂。此男子施食非女人施。此女人施食非男子施。童男童女亦復如是。又云。此是美食非麤糲食。若入聚落應得恭敬非不恭敬。應得富家。若男若女童男童女。種種美味。非貧賤家。所得飲食³。如是勿起一切不善作意。乃至。

VI.4

B 27, J 166a30, K 893b19, T 646a10:

迦葉。乞食比丘應如是自莊嚴。此是乞食常所行法。若乞食時得與不得無有憂喜。不應生於麤細食想。何以故。多有衆生貪著美味。由著味⁴故作諸惡業。惡業因緣故墮⁵於地獄畜生餓鬼。若知足者不貪美味。應捨細食受取麤食。除舌著味其心知足。得極麤食亦當知足。彼若命終生於天上或生人中。生天上已食天美⁶食。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100b2-5:

若有衆生著食味者。造惡業已墮於地獄。復次。有知足者。不著美

¹ F, K, T: insert 時, omitted by B, J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z.

² J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: insert 與.

³ There seems to be a serious displacement of text here; see the Translation.

⁴ B omits 由著味, skipping from 味 to 味.

⁵ B: 隨 for 墮.

⁶ B: 美味 for 美.

味。捨細受。舌根喜足。若節約食者。彼命終時得生天上人間或餘善道。若天若人食天美食。

VI.5

B 30, J 166b7, K 893c5, T 646a17:

迦葉。如是乞食比丘。離於味愛以調伏心。若七日噉豆亦不生憂。

何以故。趣活身故我今食已。足以修道以是故食。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100b6-8:

迦葉波。如是行乞食比丘。離於味愛調伏其心。設唯噉熟豆亦不憂惱。何以故。爲求聖道趣活身命。是以故食。以要言之。

VI.6

B 32, J 166b10, K 893c8, T 646a20:

迦葉。乞食比丘。得此食分墮鉢中者。如法所得。如法利養。應與梵行比丘共食此食。

VI.7

B 33, J 166b12, K 893c11, T 646a22:

迦葉。乞食比丘或時有病。無有使人不能乞食。此應如是調伏其心。我獨無侶一身出家。法是我伴。我應念法。今我病苦。如世尊說諸比丘應念於法。

四分律行事鈔資持記 T. 1805 (XL) 411a5-7:

下指寶梁經。彼云。乞食比丘或病不能乞食。當自伏心云。我獨無侶一身出家。法是我伴。等。

Allusion in T. 1804 (XL) 143c7?

VI.8

B 34, J 166b15, K 893c15, T 646a25:

我所聞法應善思惟。云何善思惟。如實觀身。如實觀身已。有智慧者若獨一心能得初禪。則有是處得初禪樂。若一日若二日乃至七日。以禪爲食其心歡悅。迦葉。乞食比丘行如是法若不得禪。應如是勤行安住善法中。有多人所知諸天龍神送食與之。此是離扼¹報故。

VI.9

B 37, J 166b21, K 893c22, T 646b2:

迦葉。或乞食比丘。值天大雨或大風塵不能乞食。爾時。以慈爲食而自莊嚴。於所行法安住思惟。若二夜三夜不得食者。應生是念。有多衆生墮餓鬼中。作惡業故苦惱所切。乃至百歲不得一唾。我今安住諸法門中。應生是念。身心羸劣。今我堪忍飢渴。勤修聖道不應退轉。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100b8-18:

佛言。迦葉波。若行乞食比丘。值天大雨雲霧等時不能乞食。乃至思法莊嚴以慈爲食。住是作意。若二夜三夜欲斷食者應作是想。彼琰摩羅界墮餓鬼中。以惡作故於百歲中欲食少唾尚不可得。我今安住甚深法中不應發起身心羸劣。況復勤修聖道。我今堪忍如是飢渴。又總略云。

VI.10

B 40, J 166b27, K 894a7, T 646b8:

¹ J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 扼 for 扼, and so for 扼 below.

迦葉。乞食比丘不應親近在家之人。男子女人童男童女。迦葉。
若乞食比丘令在家人擇去食中諸不淨物。於坐處坐應爲說法乃至
食淨。還受食已從坐起去。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100b18-19:

令在家人爲作淨食。敷座而座爲說法要乃至彼作淨食。受此食已從
座而去。

VI.11

B 42, J 166c1, K 894a11, T 646b12:

迦葉。乞食比丘不應自現諛諂。云何自現諛諂。若爲他人說如是
言。我今乞得麤惡之食。又復不足與多衆共食¹我食少。我今飢
渴身力羸劣。迦葉。是名自現諛諂。迦葉。乞食比丘如是之事應
當遠離。迦葉。乞食比丘於一切事應生捨心。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100b19-21:

迦葉波。行乞食比丘不應自銜諛諂。云何諛諂。若爲他說此麤惡食
而復不足。乃至持此多衆共食。若食少者令彼飢渴。若有如是行相。
是名諛諂。諸行乞食比丘應當棄捨。云何真實。

VI.12

B 45, J 166c6, K 894a17, T 646b17:

若食墮鉢中。若麤若細若少若多若淨若不淨。一切應受心無憂喜。
常應淨心觀諸法相。趣得活身爲行聖道。是故受食。

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 100b21-23:

謂食墮鉢中。若麤若細及淨不淨。皆悉應食。不生憂惱。唯淨內心

¹

F: 令 for 食.

以法調伏。住聖道故得活身命。乃行乞食。

VI.13

B 46, J 166c9, K 894a21, T 646b20:

迦葉。乞食比丘或時入於城邑聚落次第乞食。若不得食空鉢而出。應念。如來有大威德。捨轉輪王位而行出家。斷一切惡法。成一切善法。入村乞食尚空鉢出。況我薄福不種善根。不空鉢還也。是故不應生憂。何以故。不種善根能得飽食細食。無有是處。

VI.14

B 49, J 166c15, K 894b5, T 646b26:

我不得食。或自有魔。或魔所使。或魔覆蔽諸婆羅門居士。令我乞食不得。我當勤修離於四魔。斷一切煩惱。若我勤修如是道已。非魔波旬。非魔所使能作留難。迦葉。乞食比丘。應如是受持聖種。

糞掃衣比丘品

第七

VII.1

B 52, J 166c21, K 894b12, T 646c3:

佛告迦葉。畜糞掃¹衣比丘。捨糞掃物作如是想。爲慚愧故。非以衣自嚴飾故。爲障²風³吹日曝⁴蚊虻⁵墓⁶子⁷諸惡觸故。安住佛教故。非求淨好故。於糞掃中捨取棄物。取時應生二種想。何等二。一者。知足想。二者。易養想。

VII.2

B 54, J 166c25, K 894b17, T 646c7:

復生二想。一者。無慢想。二者。持聖種想。

VII.3

B 54, J 166c26, K 894b18, T 646c8:

復生二想。一者。不以嚴身。二者。令心淨故。

¹ The term 糞掃 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c5.

² B: 障 for 障.

³ The term 郭風 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c6.

⁴ The term 日曝 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c7-8.

⁵ B: 蚋 for 虻. The term 蚊 蚋 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c9.

⁶ B, J, K: 蟻 for 墓.

⁷ The term 蟻子 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c10.

VII.4

B 55, J 166c27, K 894b20, T 646c9:

迦葉。畜糞掃衣比丘。於糞掃中捨取棄物時。若於是處見諸親族知識。見已即止不取。而作是念。此諸人輩¹或呵²責我言。汝是不淨人。迦葉。我說是比丘不得淨行。何以故。畜糞掃衣比丘。心堅如石外物不入。亦不能動故。

VII.5

B 57, J 167a2, K 894c3, T 646c14:

迦葉。畜糞掃衣比丘。捨糞掃中物。應淨浣濯令無垢膩。浣已好染。染已作僧伽梨。善合善綴³善縫⁴善受。受⁵已應著莫令綻壞⁶。

VII.6

B 59, J 167a5, K 894c6, T 646c17:

迦葉。畜糞掃衣比丘。安住不淨觀中著糞掃衣爲離欲故。慈心著糞掃衣爲離瞋恚故。觀十二因緣著糞掃衣爲離癡故。正思惟著糞掃衣爲斷一切煩惱故。攝護諸根著糞掃衣爲知六入故。不諛⁷

¹ J, K: 輩 for 輩.

² J: 訶 for 呵.

³ The term 善綴 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c12.

⁴ The term 善縫 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c13.

⁵ B: omits 受.

⁶ The term 綻壞 is quoted and defined by the *Xuanying yiqiejing yinyi* 玄應一切經音義 (Zhou 1963: 396.6-397.3) as follows: 又作祖綻二形同徒覓反說文綻補綻也. It is also found in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c14.

⁷ B, S: 論 for 諛.

諂¹著糞掃衣爲令諸天龍神喜悅故。

VII.7

B 61, J 167a10, K 894c12, T 646c22:

迦葉。何故名糞掃衣。迦葉。譬如死灰²。人所不食。不生我所心。法應除棄。迦葉。如是糞掃衣。非我。非我所。是易得。非邪命。不求他。不觀他顏色。捨棄之物。糞掃無異。亦無所屬。是故名糞掃衣。

VII.8

B 63, J 167a14, K 894c17, T 646c26:

迦葉。糞掃衣³。是法幢⁴以大仙人故。是姓以聖人故。是安住以聖種故。是專念以善法儀式故。是善護以戒衆故。是向門以定衆故。是安住以慧衆故。是身以解脫衆故。是順法以解脫知見衆故。迦葉。如是畜糞掃衣得大福德。無所希求。無所貪著。能離慢心。能捨重擔。

VII.9

B 66, J 167a20, K 895a2, T 647a3:

迦葉。若有比丘畜糞掃衣。以知足故。諸天龍鬼神食樂欲見。迦葉。畜糞掃衣比丘若入禪定。釋梵四天王。長跪合掌頭面作禮。

¹ J: 諂 for 諂.

² J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 屍 for 灰.

³ B: 衣者 for 衣.

⁴ B: 幢服 for 幢.

況餘小天。

VII.10

B 68, J 167a23, K 895a5, T 647a6:

迦葉。若有惡比丘。勤求衣服以嚴飾身。外現淨行而內具足貪欲
恚癡。雖作如是好嚴飾身而諸天龍神不至其所禮敬供養。何以故。
知此比丘勤求衣服以嚴飾身。不除心心數法垢。諸天知故則遠捨
去。

VII.11

B 70, J 167a28, K 895a11, T 647a11:

迦葉。汝見周那沙彌拾不淨臭穢糞掃中物。乞食¹已至阿耨大池
欲浣濯之。爾時。池邊有常住諸天。皆遠奉迎頭面作禮。彼諸天
等皆樂淨潔。而取周那沙彌所捉不淨糞掃衣。而爲浣之令無垢穢。
又取浣汁自以洗身。諸天知周那能持淨戒。入諸禪定有大威德。
是故奉迎恭敬作禮。

四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 T. 1804 (XL) 129c15-16:

寶梁經。周那沙彌洗糞掃衣。諸天取汁自洗身。

VII.12

B 73, J 167b4, K 895a19, T 647a17:

迦葉。汝見須跋陀梵志。著淨潔衣乞食已。欲至阿耨大池時。常
住諸天。於池四面面各五里遙遮梵志不令近池。恐以不淨食及以

¹ J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: insert 食.

殘食汚此大池。迦葉。

VII.13 B 75, J 167b8, K 895a23, T 647a21:

汝今現見此事。以聖人正行威德故得是果¹。周那沙彌所有不淨糞掃中物而諸天取之爲浣亦以浣汁自洗其身。須跋陀梵志去池五里不令近之。迦葉。誰聞是已於聖法中不勤修學。彼諸聖人諸天世人。皆來頭面禮敬供養。

VII.14 B 78, J 167b13, K 895b6, T 647a26:

迦葉。欲求如是聖德故。畜糞掃衣。迦葉。畜糞掃衣比丘。安住聖種不應生憂。於糞掃衣應生塔想。應生世尊想。應生出世想。應生無我無我所想。如是觀已著糞掃衣。應如是調伏其心。

VII.15 B 80, J 167b17, K 895b11, T 647b1:

由心淨故得身淨。非身淨故得心淨。迦葉。是故當淨其心莫嚴飾身。何以故。由心淨故。於佛法中得名梵行。

VII.16 B 81, J 167b19, K 895b14, T 647b4:

迦葉。如是畜糞掃衣比丘。能如是學則爲學我。亦學於汝。迦葉。

¹ B: 果報 for 果.

若汝能畜如是龜衣。則便知足行於聖種。迦葉。汝僧伽梨若著
 床¹上若在坐處。著²憂多羅僧經行。則有千萬諸天禮汝僧伽梨。
 此僧伽梨是戒定慧所薰者。覆身之衣。迦葉。當知汝衣尚得如是
 尊重禮敬。況汝身耶。

VII.17 B 84, J 167b25, K 895b21, T 647b10:

迦葉。我捨轉輪王位出家學道。先所著好上妙繪衣。頭³羅衣。
 好細疊衣。諸上妙衣。一切著已。我今知足行於聖種爲餘人故身
 捨好⁴服畜塚⁵間衣。若當來比丘。聞我此法即得學我。

VII.18 J 167b29, K 895c3, T 647b14:

迦葉。汝本有金縷⁶上衣。我從汝索。汝持與我。迦葉。我愍汝
 故即爲汝受。非以貪故。非以嚴身故。

VII.19 J 167c2, K 895c6, T 647b16:

迦葉。有惡比丘。不能學我亦不學汝。爲貪所覆多畜衣鉢積聚飲

¹ B, J, K: 牀 for 床.

² J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 若 for 著.

³ B end here at line 84 with 頭. F: inserts 頭.

⁴ J, M, N, Q, S, Y, Z: 妙 for 好.

⁵ J: 冢 for 塚.

⁶ The term 金縷 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c15.

食藏舉不捨。亦畜金銀琉璃穀米牛羊鷄猪驢馬車乘犁具。家業所須皆求畜之。迦葉。有智之人雖在於家能增善法。非癡人出家得是善分。

VII.20

J 167c6, K 895c11, T 647b21:

云何智人在家能增長善法。迦葉。若有出家以袈裟遶項。無沙門行多有緣事。種種繫縛求好衣食。著袈裟已。在家人見禮敬給施衣服飲食臥具湯藥來去迎送。迦葉。在家之人得如是善法。彼出家人無有是事。何以故。彼出家人多求所須。不能施他故。

VII.21

J 167c12, K 895c18, T 647b26:

迦葉。當來有比丘。多畜衣鉢多有諸物。時彼比丘多爲諸在家人所見禮敬尊重讚歎。何以故。謂是。比丘多受他施。或持與我。我有所須能時時與。

VII.22

J 167c15, K 895c22, T 647c1:

迦葉。或有比丘持戒。見世過患。勤修善法。離一切漏。如救頭然。其心知足少諸緣事。勤修自利。離於一切習惡緣者。而彼比丘無人往至其所無親近者。無禮敬尊重讚歎者。何以故。彼在家

人輕躁¹ 淺薄。見現世利不見後世利。彼在家人生如是心。此比丘邊不得利益。用親近爲用禮敬尊重讚歎。爲除貧窮人少善根者。宿緣應敬者。迦葉。如是人等親近禮敬尊重讚歎。持戒比丘以爲善知識。

VII.23

J 167c24, K 896a10, T 647c10:

迦葉。如是說已稱可二種人意。何等二。一者。若見四聖諦。二者。若見生死過患。復有二。一者。勤行欲離四扼²。二者。欲得沙門果。復有二。一者。專念業報。二者。欲知諸法相義。

VII.24

J 167c27, K 896a15, T 647c13:

迦葉。我今閉塞一切懈怠者門。所謂。不知業不知業報者。離善儀式者。不見後世過惡喻如金剛。見現世利不見後世利。不生一念向解脫門者。

VII.25

J 168a1, K 896a19, T 647c17:

迦葉。我今說彼惡比丘不應希望。若說如是法。若遇如是法。聞如是法已自知所行。不解深法而誹謗之。謂。非佛說。是論師作

¹ The term 輕躁 is quoted and defined in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 T. 2128 (LIV) 400c16.

² M, S, Y: 扼 for 扼.

或魔所說。用教餘人。彼惡比丘如是自害亦復害他。自染垢污亦垢污他。是惡比丘。不能自利亦不利他。

VII.26

J 168a6, K 896b2, T 647c22:

爾時。摩訶迦葉白佛言。世尊。如諸佛大悲故。說專行比丘於諸法中得自在者。如來於此經中已廣說竟。世尊。若有衆生聞此經已。信解讀誦向如實法。當知是諸衆生已爲諸佛之所攝取。

VII.27

No equivalent to Tibetan VII.27 in Chinese.

VII.28

J 168a10, K 896b8, T 647c27:

爾時。佛告阿難。若有受持是經者。已於先佛種諸善根故。今欲得此經讀誦通利。欲得解脫。所謂。善男子。善女人。若出家學若在家學。此法門能斷諸漏亦得涅槃。

VII.29

J 168a14, K 896b12, T 648a1:

阿難白佛言。世尊。我欲受持此經。當何名此經。云何受持。

VII.30

J 168a15, K 896b14, T 648a3:

佛告阿難。此經名選擇一切法寶。亦名安住聖種儀式。亦名攝取

持戒者。亦名節解破戒者。亦名寶梁。亦名寶聚¹。亦名寶藏。
亦名諸寶法門。

VII.31

J 168a19, K 896b17, T 648a6:

摩訶迦葉。問大乘寶梁經竟²。諸比丘衆。聞佛所說歡喜奉
行。³

¹ Reading 聚 with F, J, M, N, Q, Y, for 取 of other versions.

² F: ends here, omitting the last 12 characters of the text.

³ There follows the indication of the *juan*: 大寶積經卷第一百一十四.

APPENDIX

Appendix

The Texts of the *Ratnarāṣi* and Related Materials

The Title

The Sanskrit title of the *Ratnarāṣi-sūtra* is preserved for us not only in the Tibetan Kanjur, but also in quotations of the text in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. The Sanskrit title is also provided in a Chinese catalogue dating to 1306, and there we find the transcription 阿唎二合亞囉怛二合拏阿囉室, that is, **Ārya-ratna-rāṣi*.¹ Since this catalogue, however, was compiled on the basis of the Tibetan Kanjur, it merely confirms the reading in the Kanjurs and cannot be taken as independent evidence. The Tibetan translation of the sūtra, and Tibetan catalogues, render the title as *Rin po che'i phung po*. In the Chinese canon, in which the text is counted only as a “section” (*hui* 會) of the *Mahā-ratnakūṭa* collection, it is called *Baoliangju-hui* 寶梁聚會 (Japanese *Hōryōju-e*), but catalogues and other sources also call it a “sūtra,” *jing* 經, thus *Baoliangju-jing* 寶梁聚經 (Japanese *Hōryōju-kyō*). Several alternative titles are also given in the sūtra itself.² In the section at the end of the sūtra (*parīdanā*), the following alternative titles are offered:

選擇一切法寶 = *Chos thams cad yang dag par bsduṣ pa*, “The Collection of all Dharmas.”³

¹ 至元法寶勘同總錄, Taishō volume 99, number 25: 186b8. It is on the basis of this catalogue that Nanjio 1883 reconstructed most of his Sanskrit titles. I express here my thanks to Prof. Hirata Shōji 平田昌司 of Kyoto University who was kind enough to go through the transcriptions of the titles of all the texts of the *Ratnakūṭa* collection. The full materials he supplied me will be included in my complete catalogue of the collection, still in preparation. According to William Baxter III of the University of Michigan, the title strictly speaking should be transcribed *a-rya-ra-tna-a-ra-ṣit*. The final *-t* is problematic.

² We have to notice, however, that these titles cannot by any means be considered exclusive. In addition to the potential confusion between *Ratnarāṣi* and *Ratnakūṭa*, on which see below, note the following in the final words of the *Sāgarāmātī* T. 379 (S) (XIII) 74c6-7: 是故此經名大寶聚. The expression seems to be absent in the Tibetan translation.

³ In Chinese and Japanese readings *Xuanze yiqie fabao* / *Sentaku issai hōbō*. We might reconstruct **Sarvadharmasamuccaya*. The Chinese and Tibetan versions are not here always strictly parallel. I have translated the Tibetan, but taken hints toward its understanding from the Chinese, and from the Sanskrit I have imagined to lie behind it.

安住聖種儀式 = *'Phags pa 'i rigs sbyangs pa 'i yon tan gyi gnas*,
 “Dwelling in the noble behaviors and ascetic practices.”¹

攝取戒者 = *Tshul khrims dang ldan pa yongs su 'dzin pa*, “Embracing
 those who uphold the precepts.”²

節解破戒者 = *Tshul khrims 'chal pa spa 'gong ba*, “Censure of precept
 breakers.”³

寶梁 = (?) *Rin po che brtsegs pa*, “Collection of Jewels.”⁴

寶聚 = *Rin po che 'i phung po*, “Heap of Jewels.”⁵

寶藏 = *Rin po che bsags pa*, “Accumulation of Jewels.”⁶

諸寶法門 = *Rin po che 'i chos kyi sgo 'i le'u*, “The Chapter of the Jeweled
 Dharma-Gate.”⁷

The text is divide into seven chapters, the structure of which has been discussed
 above. The titles of the chapters are as follows:

1	沙門品	<i>dge sbyong</i>	<i>*śramaṇa</i>
2	比丘品	<i>dge slong</i>	<i>*bhikṣu</i>
3	旃陀羅品	<i>dge slong gdol pa lta bu</i>	<i>*caṇḍālabhikṣu</i>
4	營事比丘品	<i>zhal ta byed pa</i>	<i>*vaiyāprtyakara</i>
5	阿欄若比丘品	<i>dgon pa pa</i>	<i>*āraṇyaka</i>
6	乞食比丘品	<i>bsod snyoms spyod pa</i>	<i>*pauṇḍrapātika</i>
7	糞掃衣比丘品	[No Tibetan title]	<i>*pāṃśukūlika</i>

I have only once found the text quoted with one of these chapter titles, however,
 in the tenth century *Kongqiaojing yinyi* 孔雀經音義, in which the expression 大寶積經

¹ *Anju shengzhong yishi / Anjū shōjū gishiki. *Āryavaṃśadhūtaguṇa-?*

² *Shequjiezhe / Shōshukaisha. *Śīlavatparigraha.*

³ *Jiejie pojiezhe / Sekkai hakaisha. *Duḥśīlāvasādana.*

⁴ *Baoliang / Hōryō. *Ratnakūṭa.*

⁵ *Baoju / Hōju. *Ratnarāśi.*

⁶ *Baocang / Hōzō. *Ratna-?*

⁷ *Zhubaofamen / Shobōhōmon. *Ratnadharma-mukha / dvāra.*

沙門品云 is found.¹ I have not run across any other quotations from or references to the *Ratnarāṣi* cited by the title of a single chapter only, as sometimes happens when (usually larger) texts are quoted. What we normally find are quotations attributed to a 寶積經, 寶聚經, or 寶梁經, which is to say **Ratnakūṭa* and what we might understand as two renderings of *Ratnarāṣi*. It is really quite extraordinary that the *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 of Daoshi 道世 at IV.10 quotes the text as the *Baoliang baoyin-jing* 寶梁寶印經, and the *Zhujing yaoji* 諸經要集 as merely *Baoyin-jing* 寶印經. The first title appears to be otherwise unknown, while the second occurs as the title of an “apocrypha” in the sūtra catalogues.² At least one copy of this *Baoyin-jing* appears to have existed in Japan, but it is not clear if the text is extant today.³ I know of only one other reference to a *Baoyin-jing*, and it is interesting that it is associated there with the *Ratnarāṣi*, *Ratnakūṭa*, *Buddhapiṭakaduḥśīlanirgraha* and related texts. The passage is found in a work of the thirteenth century Kego scholar Gyōnen 凝然, his *Bommō kaihon shonichi jushō* 梵網戒本疏日珠鈔, in which he refers to (or quotes?) the eighth century Yogācāra scholar Zhizhou 智周 as appealing to a *Baoyin-jing* along with other texts.⁴ Two works in the Taishō canon are attributed to Zhizhou, but in a very hasty search I failed to locate any such passage.⁵ It remains, in any case, unclear why the *Ratnarāṣi* should be cited under this erroneous title by an author, Daoshi, who has elsewhere extensively quoted the text

¹ T. 2244 (LXI) 758c8. Quoting I.2.

² T. 2149 (LV) 336a3, with the comment 336a16 that it is a 偽經. See also T. 2153 (LV) 473c20, with comment at 474c11, T. 2154 (LV) 677a15, 28-b2, and T. 2157 (LV) 1021c12, 24-26.

³ Makita 1976: 396 refers to the *Dainippon Komonjo* 大日本古文書, kan 7.12, which records a requisition of four sheets of paper on which to copy the text. Makita notices T. 2149 (LV) 336a3, and mentions that the text is not found among the Dunhuang manuscripts. On page 388 Makita lists it (number 27) among the Shōsōin Monjo 正倉院文書. The text was (is?) apparently in one *juan*.

⁴ T. 2247 (LXII) 146a16-17, with the mention that 智周云。請讀佛藏經・寶梁經・寶印經・寶積經・迦葉經・眞偽沙門經等. Makita 1976 does not mention this passage.

⁵ The two texts are T. 1833 and 1864. The former is quite voluminous (167 Taishō pages). I skimmed through the texts, both of which contain extensive citations of Mahāyāna sūtras and śāstras, but not with care, and it is quite possible that I missed the reference.

under its correct title.

I mentioned above that I believe there to be a close connection between the *Ratnarāṣi* and the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. In this regard, let us look at the names of the two texts, and then at their respective positions in the canon. The title of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* found in the text itself is (*Mahā*) *Ratnakūṭa*,¹ translated into Tibetan as *dkon mchog brtsegs pa (chen po)*.² Although the issue considered in its entirety gets fairly complicated, for the moment let us be content with a few preliminary remarks.³ It seems that all the information we have concerning the titles of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* points to the fact that its original title was indeed **Ratnakūṭa*.⁴ We can easily illustrate

¹ §§ 52, 150, 157, 159, 160, *165.

² Chinese has the following equivalents in §52: T. 350 (Han translation) 極大珍寶之積遺日羅經, T. 351 (Jin translation) 寶嚴經, T. 310 (43) (Qin translation) 寶積經, T. 352 (Song translation) 大寶積正法. T. 659 (included in the *Ratnamegha* translation) is problematic, and will be left out of consideration here.

³ These are based largely on Nagao's 1973 discussion.

⁴ All references in the text itself, its Tibetan translation, *Sthiramati's commentary, and in Sanskrit quotations of the sūtra consistently refer to it as **Ratnakūṭa*. The Chinese evidence is not as absolutely unequivocal, but is also overwhelming. The title of the Chinese Han dynasty translation as preserved in the currently available versions is *Foshuo Yiri monibao-jing* 佛說遺日摩尼寶經. The term *Yiri* 遺日, however, occurs in the sūtra itself more fully as *Yiriluo* 遺日羅. Wogihara Unrai (Staël-Holstein 1926: IX) suggested that this is probably an error for *Yiyueluo* 遺日羅, a transcription of the Sanskrit term *vipula* or *vaipulya*. (See also Tsukinowa 1971: 395.) Paul Pelliot agreed, and discussed the phonetics of the transcription in some detail, 1936: 69-70. Pointing out that 遺 should probably be read not *yi* but rather *wei*, he suggested that the reading be **weiyueluo*, rendering Prakritic **vivula* = *vipula*. The *Chu sancang ji* 大藏經 T. 2154 (LV) 19b19 lists a 大珍寶積惟日經. The same is found in the *Kaiyuan shijiao-lu* T. 2154 (LV) 518b16, with remarks c1-6. This is almost identical with the reading in the Han translation of the KP itself §52: 極大珍寶之積遺日羅經. This fact strongly supports the suggestion that 遺 is to be read *wei*. The term *monibao* 摩尼寶 is of course a standard transcription-cum-translation of *maṇi-ratna*. If we accept these revisions, the title of the Han translation seems to refer to a Prakritic version of something like Sanskrit **Vaipulya-maṇi-ratna* or **Ratnakūṭa-vaipulya*. Although the Song version appears to represent **Kāśyapaparipṛcchā-Mahāratnakūṭa* (?), and the Jin translation has the alternate end-title **Mahākāśyapa* Section, the bulk of the evidence is firmly in favor of the reading **Ratnakūṭa*.

Nagao 1973: 22 remarks that: "According to Unrai Wogihara's Sanskrit-Japanese Dictionary, the term *ratnakūṭa* is rendered into Chinese as *baoji* 寶積 and *baoji* 寶集, or *baoding* 寶頂 and *baofeng* 寶峯, or again as *baoyan* 寶嚴. The word *kūṭa* means prominence, protuberance, summit, so these Chinese translations all seem possible. But the term *baoding* also represents Sanskrit *ratnaketu*, *ratnacūḍa*, *ratnaśikhara* and *ratnakoṭi*, these being the names of texts, bodhisattvas and samādhis. At the same time *baoji* also corresponds to *ratnarāṣi*, *ratnākara*, and *ratnakoṭi*. In both Sanskrit and the corresponding Chinese there are many ideas referring to similar notions. Among those relevant to the idea of "heaps of jewels" are included *ratnakūṭa*, *ratnarāṣi* and *ratnākara*, while those corresponding to "highest jewel"

one aspect of the close connection between the *Ratnarāṣi* and *Kāśyapaparivarta* by recalling that we have among the alternate titles of the sūtra just listed the name *Rin po che brtsegs pa*, that is to say **Ratnakūṭa*, and that the text is often quoted under the title *Baoji-jing* 寶積經, again **Ratnakūṭa*. There can be little question, I believe, that this registers a conscious and intentional allusion to the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. Whether this intention may be attributed to the original author(s) of the *Ratnarāṣi* must remain unanswered. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the tradition which redacted the sūtra, added the *parīdanā* (at whatever stage this may have taken place), and then subsequently transmitted the text did attach to it a name which evokes and brings to mind the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. That is not all. Although the so-to-speak pre-history of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection in India remains unclear, as far as the collection is traceable the *Ratnarāṣi* and *Kāśyapaparivarta* stand next to each other in all editions of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* in both Chinese and Tibetan (although their relative ordering is sometimes reversed). I believe this too is no accident, and indicates a traditional understanding of the association between the two texts. I discussed above other reasons for closely associating the two texts, based on content and the way in which certain themes of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* are picked up and expanded upon in the *Ratnarāṣi* which reinforce this impression.

An examination of the materials upon which the present study is based reveals much about the history of the different versions of the scripture.

include *ratnakūṭa* and *ratnakōṭi*. The one term which includes both concepts seems to be *ratnakūṭa*, and thus this seems the most suitable term for a text title."

The Tibetan Materials

Since I have recently had the opportunity to publish a rather lengthy discussion on text criticism of the Tibetan Kanjur canonical materials, I think there is little need to go into detail here on matters concerning which the interested reader may refer to my earlier work.¹ I will, therefore, examine here only those details not brought under scrutiny in my previous publication. The matters to be dealt with here, then, fall under the following heads: First, I will discuss the precise materials used for the present edition, canonical and otherwise. This includes information about the Dunhuang manuscripts referred to, and new Kanjur materials not previously available. Second, I will discuss details about the translators, the colophon, entries in catalogues and so forth. And finally, I will offer a few revisions to my earlier remarks on Kanjur text criticism which may be suggested on the basis of this further study.

The *Ratnarāṣi* is found in all known versions of the Tibetan Kanjur, in the *Dkon brtsegs* section. In the following I list the most important, as well as the most well-known, editions, in which the *Ratnarāṣi* is found in the following locations:

- A: The Tabo Kanjur. Section *ka*.² Only folios 382-84, 386-87, and 390 are available. See below.
- B: Berlin Manuscript Kanjur. *cha* 150a1-182a7.³
- C 1029: Cone Kanjur. *cha* 161a3-186b4.⁴

¹ Silk 1994.

² I was informed that the notation *ka-na* on the manuscript leaves indicates that the numbering is in the 300s by Cristina Scherer-Schaub during the 11th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies in Mexico City. I am grateful to Paul Harrison for sharing with me photographs he and Dr. Scherer-Schaub took in Tabo of the *Ratnarāṣi* materials, and to the project coordinator, Prof. E. Steinkellner, for his generous permission to make use of those materials.

³ See Beckh 1914 for a catalogue of this Kanjur. The Staatsbibliothek provided me with a very clear microfilm of B.

⁴ This is catalogued in Mibu 1959. I have collated this Kanjur only for the first few pages of the edition and have confirmed what is rather well known, namely that C is not independent of J. If J is collated C may be ignored.

D 88:	Derge Kanjur. <i>cha</i> 152a1-175b2. ¹
F:	Phug brag Manuscript Kanjur. <i>cha</i> 202a6-234a8. ²
H 88:	Lhasa Kanjur. <i>cha</i> 260b5-298a4. ³
J 343:	'Jang sa tham / Lithang Kanjur. <i>cha</i> 164b6-189b5. ⁴
L:	London Manuscript Kanjur. <i>cha</i> 168a3-194a2. ⁵
M 33-43	Tōyō Bunko Manuscript Kanjur. <i>cha</i> 207b1-237a8. ⁶
N 76:	Narthatang Kanjur. <i>cha</i> 261a2-298b7. ⁷
P 760 (45):	Peking Kanjur. 'i 146b4-173b1. ⁸
S 11.44:	sTog Palace Manuscript Kanjur. <i>cha</i> 249a1-284b7. ⁹
U 88:	Urga Kanjur. <i>cha</i> 152a1-175b2. ¹⁰

There exist other Kanjur materials as well, but they remain unavailable and even their position in the stemma of Kanjur editions remains more or less unknown or unconfirmed. Since the present study is not a theoretical one but is limited to those materials I have brought under scrutiny, I do not take these other sources into account further.¹¹

¹ One may refer to the well-known catalogue of Ui et al. 1934 for the Derge edition. I have used the so-called Rumtek Derge. Although I consulted the Indian reprint, this should be identical with the version recently republished in Taiwan.

² I am very grateful to the IASWR for microfiche of the Phug brag, and especially to Dr. Helmut Eimer for kindly locating for me the numbers of the exact fiche I needed.

³ Refer to the catalogue of Takasaki 1965. I have not collated this Kanjur, which is known to be a virtual copy of N.

⁴ See Imaeda 1982a, 1982b, 1984. Dr. L. van der Kuijp most kindly presented me with copies of the text from J, for which I am most appreciative.

⁵ There is no published catalogue of the London Manuscript Kanjur, though one may refer to Grinstead 1967 for a sketch. I am indebted to my friend Yamagiwa Nobuyuki 山極伸之 for sharing with me his copy of the British Library microfilm of L.

⁶ See the catalogue by Saitō 1977. The authorities of the Tōyō Bunko were ever efficient in supplying very clear photos of M.

⁷ For a catalogue see Nagashima 1975. I am grateful to Prof. Onoda Shunzō 小野田俊蔵 for sharing his microfiche of N with me.

⁸ For an excellent catalogue, see Sakurabe Bunkyō 1930-32. In the Peking reprint edition, the text is found at: XXIV: 206e4-217d1. I have, of course, used this reprint edition.

⁹ See Skorupski 1985. I have used the reprint edition.

¹⁰ One may refer to Bethlenfalvy 1980 for a catalogue. I have not collated this Kanjur, which is a copy of D.

¹¹ See Bethlenfalvy 1982, for example. The Kanjur listed there is the same as that listed by Jaya Paṇḍita. See Lokesh Chandra 1981. The *Ratnarāṣi* is listed in Bethlenfalvy's catalogue in the *dkon bṛtsegs*, *cha* 225a8-254a7, and by Jaya Paṇḍita in volume 4, page 216a3 (number 431 in the reproduction):

For the present edition I have utilized the following editions of the Tibetan Kanjur (those given in bold type above): A, B, D, F, J, L, M, N, P, S. I have examined all of these versions in photographic reproductions only, and have not had the opportunity to confirm unclear readings by examinations of the originals. There remain therefore several places at which the exact reading could not be clarified. In addition, it is common in Tibetan xylographic materials, and especially those which cannot be examined at first hand, that the *nga* and *da*, and *ba* and *pa*, are indistinguishable. When I have been able to distinguish them and they seem to point to variant readings, I have noted this, but the non-notation of such a variant should not be taken as an indication that it does not exist. It reports rather an uncertainty, in most cases. For this reason such variants should probably not be taken into consideration when attempting to determine stemmatic relations, and I have ignored them. In manuscript Kanjurs, on the other hand, there is usually (but not always) a clear distinction between *nga* and *da* and *pa* and *ba*. Especially the latter set shows in manuscript Kanjurs a serious degree of instability indicating, perhaps, different spelling conventions than those with which we are generally familiar, or perhaps a certain lack of interest in such distinctions on the part of the scribes. I have noted these readings when I was fairly sure of them, but although such readings are found in considerable number in the apparatus I question their utility in establishing stemmatic filiations. I suspect it is better to ignore such possible variants in calculating coincidences of readings between different exemplars.

I should note that in principle I have not admitted abbreviated spellings into my edition, even when it seems that some editions which might be considered "old" suggest

zhe bzhi pa rin po che 'i phung po lung bstan pa 'i mdo bam po gnyis dang shlau ka bgyad cu pa ye shes sde 'i 'gyur. "Number 44: The **Ratnarāṣi-vyākaraṇa-sūtra*. Two volumes, 80 ślokas. A translation of Ye shes sde." The reader will no doubt note the peculiarity here that the main translator is not mentioned, while the Tibetan collaborator is.

I may also mention here that although there is a Mongolian translation of the entire Kanjur, containing of course a translation of the *Ratnarāṣi* as well, I have not consulted or utilized this.

them. It is possible that such spellings were used in some hypothetical “proto-Kanjur” version, but to this extent I have chosen to standardize my edition and exclude such spellings. They are, however, of course recorded in the apparatus.

It might be helpful to add a few words about each edition here. The **Tabo** text (A) represents probably a very old manuscript edition from the far western reaches of the Tibetan culture sphere. To the best of my knowledge the *Ratnarāṣi* fragments represent the first Kanjur text from Tabo which has been edited and placed in contrast with other canonical versions. Some of the characteristics of the Tabo materials have recently been discussed by Helmut Tauscher (1994). It is unfortunate, however, that the materials available for our text do not provide sufficient information to make any suggestions concerning the relation of the Tabo text to other Kanjur editions. Of the ten variants in A which might reasonably be considered non-random, the closest association seems to be with the Phug brag Kanjur (F), the stemmatic situation of which is likewise unclear.¹ Any suggestions about the stemmatic location of the Tabo materials will have to await further research.

The **Berlin** manuscript Kanjur (B) is, as is well known, a **Peking** (P) line text, and as such a descendant of the so-called Tshal pa Kanjur. As is already known, the Berlin manuscript represents an unrevised Peking text compared to the later version reprinted in the so-called Japanese reprint edition. I have retained the variants of these two editions in the main apparatus, although it is actually clear that more properly speaking they should be seen as two versions of one recension, and therefore placed in the single-readings apparatus.

The **'Jang sa tham** or Lithang Kanjur (J) is the other main Tshal pa text, along

¹ A, D, J, P: insert *la*. A, F, L, N: omit *dang*. A, F: *dga' bar* for *gi*. A, F: insert *na*. A, F: insert *de*. A, F: insert *la*. A, F: omit *bcom ldan 'das*. A, M: omit *pa* (twice). A, N: insert *yang*. A, S: insert *med*.

with the Peking texts. Based almost entirely upon this text is the **Derge (D)** edition, which in the present case might rather be called a virtual copy of J. In other cases it has been shown that Derge is conflated from the *Them spangs ma* tradition, but this is not so in the present case. The fact that D is identical with J should also prompt us to reconsider our general view that D is one of the best edited Kanjurs. If it is found to be more universally true that D is deeply indebted to J, even to the point of being a virtual copy, whatever positive judgements we might make concerning the editorial choices of readings found in D should perhaps lead to praise of the editors of J instead. Although I have consulted and collated it only for the first few folios, it should be noted that in the present case as in other cases, **Cone (C)** when not obviously wrong is in agreement with its source J.

The **London** manuscript Kanjur (L), Tōyō Bunko Tokyo **Manuscript (M)**, and **sTog** manuscript (S) are undoubtedly closely related stemmatically. The exact interrelations between them, however, are not totally clear. There appears to be a significantly closer relation between M and S than between L and either one of the former. In addition, there seems to be a very close connection between M and S and the **Narthatang** text (N). N is a crucial pivot in the Kanjur complex,¹ and appears attached in different cases to either the *Them spangs ma* or Tshal pa side of the textual stemma. In the present case N is obviously closely related to M and S.²

¹ It is therefore unfortunate that it is widely available only in a very poor microfiche edition. The problem is compounded by the fact that the Narthatang edition is notorious for being printed poorly on bad paper. The present sūtra text is for the most part almost illegible, and were I not working with a critical edition already in hand it is extremely unlikely I would have been able to make out much of it. To have noted each uncertain reading would have clogged the apparatus with nothing but such notes. All this should perhaps be merely taken by way of warning, that the readings for Narthatang should be understood as somewhat provisional.

² L, M, N, S: *byams pa'i* for *phyi'i*. L, M, N, S: *dgar* for *gi*. L, M, N, S: insert *pa'i 'tsho*. L, M, N, S: omit *gam*. L, M, S: insert *shas*. L, N: omit *ces*. M, N, S: add *bam po dang po /*. M, N, S: *gnas* for *man*. M, N, S: insert *ba*. M, N, S: insert *bar du*. M, N, S: insert *dag* after *de*. M, N, S: *ni* for *pa*. M, N, S: omit *du*. M, N: omit *ni*. M, N: insert *dang*. M, N: omit *can*. M, N: omit *mi*. M, N: omit *ni*

This brings us to the problematic **Phug brag** (F) edition. Oddly enough, F seems to be closely connected to M, N, and S not only jointly but also severally. In other words, there are several cases in which the variants suggest the close relation of all four editions,¹ but others in which F is related to only two or even one of the others.² This makes suggesting a hierarchical stemmatic relationship between the editions very difficult. The problem is also compounded severely by the obvious relation between F and B,³ or even B, F and one or more of the L, M, N, S group.⁴ I regret that despite what has been suggested by, among others, myself in my previous work on this subject, the evidence of the present case suggests that the stemma heretofore suggested as appropriate for Kanjur editions may not after all work well here.⁵ I cannot see how we can find either a clear East / West split or any good way to fit the Tabo or Phug brag editions into the scheme. (The Dunhuang fragments are too short to be used in this case.) For the present I must leave the matter here.

We have only two small fragmentary Dunhuang manuscripts of the *Ratnarāṣi* in Tibetan, both now in the Stein Collection in London. Although I examined on microfilm a number of manuscripts in the Paris Pelliot Tibetan collection, I was unable to identify

(twice). M, N: omit *pa*. M, N: omit *bar bya*. M, S insert: // *bam po gnyis so* // *shlau ka drug brgya bdun*. M, S: add *yang*. M, S: *dang ldan ba* for *thob pa*. M, S: insert *la*. M, S: insert *ma*. M, S: insert *po*. M, S: omit *grong ngam* /. M, S: omit *kyi*. M, S: omit *la*.

¹ F, M, N, S: insert '*dus pa* after /. F, M, N, S: omit *dang*. F, M, N, S: omit *le'u*.

² F, M, N: *khyod* for *khyed*. F, M, N: omit *du*. F, M, S: *bsam* for *bslab*. F, M, S: *chos* for *las*. F, M, S: insert *rig par*. F, M: insert *dang*. F, M: omit *la*. F, M: omit *pa* (twice). F, N, S: insert *te*. F, N: insert *ces*. F, N: insert *pa* (five cases). F, N: omit *ba*. F, N: omit *dag*. F, N: omit *pa*. F, S: *dang* for *pa*. F, S: omit *de*. F, S: omit *byed par*.

³ B, F: insert *tu*. B, F: omit // *bam po gnyis pa ste tha ma* /. B, F: omit *ma*. B, F: *rkum* for *rkun*. B, F: '*chal* for '*chab*. B, F: *dang* for *bcom pa ste*. B, F: insert *kha* after /. B, F: insert *kha*. B, F: insert *khrod*. B, F: omit *mkhyun bu*. B, F: *slong* for *sbyong*. B, F: *stsogs* for *sogs* (five times).

⁴ B, F, L, M, S: *pa* for *bya*. B, F, L, N, S: *nams* for *snayoms*, and insert *kyis*. B, F, L: omit *yin*. B, F, M, N: omit '*od srung*. B, F, M, S: insert *la*. The case of B, D, M, N, S: *lhag* for *lhad* seems to be different again.

⁵ See for example the stemma in Silk 1994: 23, and Harrison 1992: xxxvi.

any of them as containing text from the *Ratnarāṣi*.¹ The London fragments were first catalogued and identified by Louis de La Vallée Poussin, who recorded them as items 165 and 166 in his catalogue of the Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts.² I have referred to Stein 165 as Dh1 and 166 as Dh2. Dh1 is in the pothi format measuring 30.5 × 8 cm, written on five lines on the recto only. Dh2 is also a pothi, also 30.5 × 8 cm, and also written in five lines but on both recto and verso. It is marked as volume *ka*, the meaning of which however is not obvious. Exact identifications of the passages in these manuscripts, correlated with the Peking Kanjur, were made in the revised version of La Vallée Poussin's catalogue published by Yamaguchi Zuihō.³ I have printed the Dunhuang fragments side by side with the Kanjur text, since the texts diverge to some extent. It seems clear that while the texts are ultimately based on the same original translation into Tibetan, one version — probably that preserved in the Kanjur corpus — has been significantly revised.⁴ With only such a small sample of text available, however, little more can be said. Probably only the discovery of more materials will allow us to further determine the relationship between the canonical and Dunhuang versions. Not being a specialist in Tibetan calligraphy, and moreover having been able to examine printouts of microfilm only for a very short time, I apologize for offering no remarks on the paleography of the fragments which, in any case, did not impress me as being noticeably different from other *dbu-can* style Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts.

¹ In particular I paid attention to manuscripts numbered 671-79 in Lalou's 1939 catalogue. I succeeded in identifying manuscript 676 as coming from the *Kāśyapaparivarta* §§19-24, but I have not yet located the origins of any of the others. I will treat manuscript 676 in detail in my forthcoming edition of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*.

² La Vallée Poussin 1962. The original serial number of 165 is Ch. 73.IV.6, that of 166 Ch. XL.d.

³ Yamaguchi et al. 1978: 96-97. The microfilm locations are, according to Yamaguchi, roll 139, section 34, frames 3aḅ and 4a. I consulted a printout of the microfilm held in the Tōyō Bunko in Tokyo.

⁴ It is far from impossible, of course, that both versions represent significant revisions of some hypothetical proto-translation. I do not wish to claim on the basis of the evidence now available that the Dunhuang version is necessarily any more archaic than that found in the Kanjurs.

When we turn to look at what evidence the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, which quotes the *Ratnarāṣi* extensively, provides us, we quickly realize that the Tibetan translation of the former corresponds nearly exactly to the canonical, that is Kanjur, text of the latter. There can be no doubt that the revisors of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* had before them an edition of the canonical translation of the *Ratnarāṣi*, which they inserted as appropriate into their translation of Śāntideva's text. In a few places where the canonical version does not correspond precisely to the Sanskrit text in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* Tibetan version has been slightly altered. In addition, there are several places in which the Kanjur version of the *Ratnarāṣi* has apparently displaced the ordering of clauses, which appear in a different (and perhaps the original) order in the Sanskrit and Chinese texts of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the Chinese version of the *Ratnarāṣi*. The Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* agrees in these cases, however, with the ordering of clauses in the Tibetan translation of the *Ratnarāṣi*, and disagrees with all the other versions (IV.6, VI.3). In another case, additional text not found in the Sanskrit version of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* but present in the Tibetan text of the *Ratnarāṣi* is found in the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. That is, a portion of text immediately following a quoted portion, yet with no corresponding Sanskrit quotation, is nevertheless reproduced in the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, once again exactly corresponding to the Kanjur text (V.19). It is thus abundantly clear that the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has been compiled or edited in the light of the canonical version of the sūtra being quoted, the translations of the latter being used almost as is, and not always with the greatest care, to render the Sanskrit text.¹

This feature is not unique to the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*'s quotations of the *Ratnarāṣi*. I

¹ On the other hand, I cannot account for a portion of missing text in section V.21. The text there is found both in the Sanskrit *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and in the Tibetan translation of the *Ratnarāṣisūtra* itself. Why it should be missing from the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* I do not know.

have not yet made a systematic study of the problem, but a casual comparison of the quotations of other texts in the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* with their canonical versions has shown that the same phenomenon is found elsewhere. For example, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* quotes a section of verses from the *Suvarṇa(pra)bhāso-ttama-sūtra*. The Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* corresponds exactly to the canonical text, with the following difference. The Sanskrit text of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* omits a number of verses from the sequence, while the Tibetan translation has the whole series complete. It would presumably have been no trouble to delete a few verses to make the Tibetan translation correspond with the Sanskrit of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, but this was not done.¹ The presence of the missing verses and the word-for-word correspondence between the versions makes it certain that the Tibetan translators of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have borrowed the canonical translation of the sūtra from the Kanjur in rendering the śāstra.

Such examples may be multiplied many times with quotations of the *Kāśyapa-parivarta*,² *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*,³ *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā*,⁴ *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*,⁵ and others, although of course not every case contains evidence as clear as the inclusion of intermediary text omitted in the Sanskrit. In a sense the fact that the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* utilized the canonical renderings of sūtras reduces its value from

¹ The sequence of verses is IV.17-59, Nobel 1944: 22.13-28.10. These are quoted in the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* Derge 90a4-91b7. In the Sanskrit version of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* verses 34-42, 52, 54-55 are omitted. This was noted by Nobel 1937: 22 note 7, who makes no remark about the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, however.

² KP §3,4 at Derge 34b7-35a4, virtually verbatim, with some modifications in wording and word order only. §5 at 84a1-2. §6 at 36a5-6. §1.7 at 82a7-b1, and so on.

³ VKN Ōshika VI C, 59.25-33 (Lamotte VI.4) virtually verbatim at Derge 82a1-3.

⁴ Two verses from Ensink 1952: 79.9-16 (= in the Sanskrit text Finot 1901: 20.5-8) verbatim at Derge 36a3-4.

⁵ All the relevant passages have been collected, edited, studied and translated by Mochizuki 188: 244-310. His synoptic editions of the Tibetan show clearly the virtual identity of the Kanjur translation and the quotations in the Tibetan *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.

the point of view of text criticism. The Tibetan translation cannot be considered an independent witness, given its obvious dependence on the canonical versions.¹ On the other hand, it is not clear yet exactly what recension or exemplar of the Kanjur was available to the translators of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and investigations along this line might provide interesting results for the study of the dissemination of written texts within Tibet.

The entries in the Tibetan catalogues concerning the *Ratnarāṣi*, as well as the colophon, must also be examined. The early ninth century catalogue *Ldan dkar ma* lists the text, as number 68, as follows:² “**Ārya-Ratnarāṣi*. 670 ślokas, [that is,] 2 bam po and 70 ślokas.” Virtually the same is found in Bu ston’s Catalogue, number 171:³ “**Ratnarāṣi-sūtra*. 2 bam po and 70 ślokas.” In the colophon to the sūtra in the Narthang edition of the Kanjur, after the title the following, perhaps not completely clear, information is added: *bam pa gnyiso / sho loga drug brgya bdun cu //*. In the light of the catalogue references perhaps we should understand this as “Two bam po [speaking approximately, or exactly] 670 ślokas.”

The colophon in the sūtra itself reads as follows:

*’phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po’i chos kyi rnam grangs le’u
stong phrag brgya pa las / rin po che’i phung po’i le’u zhes bya ste / bzhi bcu rtsa
bzhi pa rdzogs so // // rgya gar gyi mkhan po su ren dra bo dhi dang / zhu chen
gyi lo tstsha ba ban de ye shes sdes bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa //*

The **Ratnarāṣi* chapter, the forty-fourth,⁴ from the hundred thousand

¹ This was apparently not realized by Braarvig, who states that the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is confirmed by the canonical Tibetan version of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* (Braarvig 1993: I.165). The former, however, is clearly simply quoting the latter, that is, the quotations of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* are drawn from the Kanjur version, as a comparison will quickly confirm.

² In Yoshimura’s 1950 edition it is number 67. I follow the numbering in Lalou 1953: *’phags pa rin po che’i phung po / 670 shlo ka / 2 bam po / 70 shlo ka //*.

³ In Nishioka 1980: 71: *rin po che’i phung po’i mdo 2 bam po 70 shlo ka*.

⁴ A variant, due to the different arrangement of the *Dkon brtsegs* section, has this as the forty-third section in A and B.

chapters of the **Ārya-Mahāratnakūṭa-dharmaparyāya*. Translated, revised and put in order by the Indian scholar Surendrabodhi and the chief revisor Ye shes sde.”¹

It seems, then, that we can date the translation of the *Ratnarāśi* into Tibetan to the late eighth or early ninth century. It is worth noting that since the translators of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* into Tibetan obviously had access to the Tibetan translation of the *Ratnarāśi* itself, we might suppose the translation of the latter to precede that of the former. It is also possible, however, that the translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* was systematically revised at a later date.² The translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is attributed in the colophon to Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and Ye shes sde, but it is also stated that it was later revised by the Kashmiri paṇḍit Tilakakalaśa and the famous Blo ldan shes rab, perhaps better known as Rngog lo tsā ba.³ It is possible, therefore, that although the

¹ This colophon has been translated before, from Mongolian, by Bischoff 1968: 374, as follows: “Der indische Lehrer Sulendr a bodhi (Surendrabodhi) und der grosse Übersetzer Bande Yeśes sde (Ye śes sde) haben [dieses] übersetzt, korrigiert und ediert. Das sind zwei Teile und vierzig śloken.” The Mongolian version is then credited as follows: “Kundga 'odzer Gelehrter Mañjuśrī Pandit hat dieses Sūtra auf Mongolisch übersetzt.”

² There seem to be no significant variants in the Tanjur texts of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* itself, however, which might argue against such a suggestion. One would have to compile a critical edition, and take into account vulgate texts (if available), to be sure. (It is my aim to compile such an edition in the near future, along with a re-edition of the Sanskrit text, an edition of the Chinese translation, and identification of all quotations.)

³ The colophon reads (Derge 3940, *dbu ma, khi*, 194b4-5, Peking *dbu ma, ki*, 225a8-225b1): *rgya gar gyi mkhan po dzi na mi tra dang / [P / ø] dā na shī la dang / zhu chen po [P po ø] gyi lo tsā [P tsta] ba pan de [P bande] ye shes sdes bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa // [P /] slad kyi kha che'i pa ṇḍi ta ti la ka ka la sha [P kla shu for ka la sha] dang / lo tsā [P tsta] ba dge slong blo ldan shes rab kyis [P /] sri mda'i dgon par zhu thug legs par byas pa'o //*. In the Peking edition, there follow a few verses (225b1-3), not found in Derge: *rgyal sras spyod 'dir rab dang thos mang ba // gung thang dge slong shes rab 'byung gnas kyis // blo ldan thig le bum pa'i sems bzung nas // gzhung 'dir nges bsgyur legs par zhu thug byas // she yi dang pa'i mthu dang gzhung 'di yi // che ba nyid kyis ding sang brtse ldan gyi // lam 'dir 'jug par 'dod pa'i skye bo rnam // dga' bas chos 'di phyogs bcur rgyas byed shog /*. I would offer a highly provisional translation as follows: “The monk from Gung thang, Shes rab 'byung gnas, very wise and learned in this practice of the sons of the Victor, motivated by Blo ldan thig le bum pa [= Tilakakalaśa], came to request that he translate this text. Those beings who want to enter into this path of compassion through the strength of its purity and power and the greatness of this text should, these days, spread this teaching happily through the ten directions.” On Tilakakalaśa, who worked as an assistant to Blo ldan shes rab, see Naudou 1980: 231-33.

original translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* took place in the early ninth century, its revision in the eleventh century may have involved comparison with the canonical translations and a thoroughgoing revision of the whole text. More research will be necessary concerning this problem. We will have more to say about the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* below in the discussion of the Indic materials.

The Chinese Materials

We can divide our consideration of the Chinese materials for the *Ratnarāśi* into several groups. Of these perhaps the most important are the Dunhuang manuscripts. These are our oldest original (and not recopied, and thus perhaps revised and corrupted) sources for the sūtra. In addition we have the canonical Chinese versions, and passages quoted in other works in Chinese.

The Dunhuang manuscript S(tein) 5664, catalogued by Lionel Giles as 1567, is a 9th century (800-850) manuscript of the type discussed by Fujieda Akira as type "D."¹ The manuscript is written on sheets which are arranged so that they may be folded in accordion style to make a "Tibetan style" book, but actually these are discarded sheets, written but never used for some reason or another, and containing only a part of the text, with much material missing between sheets. The paper is of local Dunhuang production. According to Giles it measures 28 × 9.5 cm, and is written on a "stiff, light buff paper."² I have called this manuscript, which covers roughly the second half of the text (IV.21-VII.17), "B."

The other Dunhuang Chinese manuscript available for this edition is that kept in

¹ Fujieda 1990: 13. I owe most of the information in this and the following paragraph, aside from that mentioned by Giles 1957, to a personal conversation with Professor Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃 (July 9, 1993).

² Giles 1957, s.v. item 1567.

Ōtani University, catalogued as number 707. It runs from II.20-IV.21, and I have labeled it “A.” Prof. Fujieda confirms my supposition that this manuscript must have been copied from an original in which the leaves were out of order for part of the text. According to Fujieda, virtually all of the Ōtani University Dunhuang manuscripts (with one exception) are “forgeries,” by which he means that they are recent copies of older manuscripts. From the point of view of paleography, the study of paper and so on, this vitiates the value of the manuscript, and thus may make it of little importance as far as Dunhuang studies proper are concerned. For this reason Fujieda himself is little interested in the Ōtani University collection. But as far as the importance of the text which is copied in a manuscript, the relatively recent manufacture of the manuscript itself does not necessarily negate the worth of the readings it has copied. And in the case of our manuscript A, we can clearly see the great value of some readings it preserves. It is worth noting, by the way, that the scribe has imitated the old style of writing certain characters which had fallen out of use hundreds of years before he, according to Fujieda’s information, could have copied the text.

An examination of the variant readings in the edition of the Chinese text printed in the present study will show that while A is far from being a really “good” manuscript — which we might define as one having few textual irregularities or outright errors — it does sometimes preserve valuable readings entirely lost in the rest of the textual tradition to which we presently have access. The lack of some important variants in the later xylographic printed versions of the canon proves that A must have been copied from an old and probably quite good exemplar, the whereabouts of which appear to be unknown at present. Based on internal evidence alone we must conclude that it is virtually impossible that A could have been copied from a canonical printed version of the sūtra.

This manuscript has been published in photographic facsimile, and a list of

variants appended; the latter is very faulty.¹ There is a colophon attached to this text, which according to the information provided by its investigator Kawachi is written on a paper different from that of the rest of the manuscript. Kawachi also suggests that the colophon (or vow-text, as he calls it) is written in a different hand from the rest of the manuscript, and others whom I have asked also seem to be of this opinion concerning the calligraphy. The colophon reads as follows:²

Ultimate wisdom is deeply profound, and without proselytizing the teachings [of the Buddha], there is no way to comprehend their essence. The proselytization must be eloquent and profound in order to be successful. [1] Thus I, the monk Huikai, realize that my merit is lacking and so I was born in [these degenerate days of] *luoyun*. Not only was I unable to be present in the nine assemblies of Śākyamuni in the past, but I will not make it to the three recitations of Maitreya.³ [2] My acute agony with regard to this, when will it end? For this reason, I looked for the holy teachings, hoping to transcend the ocean of saṃsāra in the future. [3] [For this purpose,] there is nothing better than honoring goodness. Thus I copied the *Baoliang jing*, in two scrolls, to fulfill my vow. By dint of this merit, [I hope] to help Kai's grandfathers of the past seven genera-

¹ Nogami 1972: the explanation is found on pages 12-15 of the "kaisetsuhen" 解説篇, the photographs on pages 36-41 of the separately paginated section of photos. The entry on the text is credited to Kawachi Shōen 河内昭圓.

² 夫至智淵深非宣教法无已可會其真教法要須言晉深崇而得是
以比丘惠愷自惟福薄生羅運末前不及釋迦九會後不經弥勒三
唱於中苦切何時當住是已仰尋聖教欲使将来超出生死之海
莫若崇善是以即仰寫寶梁[†]經一部兩卷而成願因此福使愷七世父
師長父母現在眷屬及以知識一切含生有識^{*}之類乘此微福願託生西方
无量壽佛國長求三趣永与苦隔並三界慶因果成仏道所願如是普
同斯誓

永熙二年歲次壬子四月八日訖

[†], ^{*}: added small in interlinear space.

I would not have been able to read this colophon completely without the transcription provided in Nogami 1972. However, that transcription has not always kept the exact form of the characters as written in the manuscript, having substituted full for simplified characters. I have, as far as possible, transcribed the characters exactly as they occur in the manuscript. I have also maintained the line divisions of the manuscript, as does the transcription in Nogami 1972. The translation of this difficult text I owe to my friend Yuet Keung Lo.

³ The reference to the nine assemblies of Śākyamuni is probably to the nine sections of the *Avatamsaka sūtra*, which in its 80 *juan* version is divided into nine assemblies. The reference to the three "recitations" of Maitreya is to the predicted three assemblies of the future buddha.

tions, [4] teachers, parents, relatives of this lifetime, as well as friends and all sentient beings, so that by virtue of this insignificant merit, they may be born in the Land of [5] the Buddha of Infinite Life in the Western Quarter, forever pursuing the three destinies (?), eternally cut off from suffering. And the Three Worlds will rejoice in their karmic fruit of attaining the Way to Buddhahood as I have vowed. [6] May this resolution be shared universally.

Finished on the eight day of the fourth month, in the second year of the Yongxi period, the year of Renzi.

Concerning the dating of this manuscript, Kawachi points out that the other known manuscripts, Stein 5664 and Pelliot 3348 (on which see below), belong to the Tang period, but following the colophon he ascribes the present manuscript to the Northern and Southern Dynasties period. He notes that the Yongxi 永熙 period belongs to the Northern Wei emperor Xiao Wudi 孝武帝, specifically signifying the years 532-534. The second year of this period, however, was not styled 壬子, but rather 癸丑; 壬子 represents the first year of the Yongxi reign. Therefore either the specification of the year of the reign or the appropriate “stem and branch” designation is wrong. As far as they go, these indications offered by Kawachi are perfectly correct. But given the fact that the manuscript, according to Fujieda, is undoubtedly of recent manufacture, it is possible to suggest a different interpretation. Perhaps the manuscript copied an original with either an incomplete colophon, or no colophon at all. Wishing to add a certain veracity to the “forgery,” the scribe looked up an ancient date and copied it into his text.¹ He may have made an error however, not quite aligning the year and the appropriate “stem and branch” designation. On the other hand, it is possible that the exemplar

¹ The reason for all of this, of course, is that residents in the Dunhuang area realized that old manuscripts were potential big money makers, with foreigners and eventually the central Chinese government buying up whatever was available. The supply, naturally, grew to meet the demand. Such “production,” fortunately seems to have been limited to Chinese materials; there seem to be no known forgeries of Tibetan Dunhuang materials, for example (at least Fujieda indicated to me that he has never encountered one).

from which A was copied was indeed a sixth century manuscript, and in the process of copying the colophon a slight error was introduced into the date. I must leave it up to specialists in this field to suggest a convincing solution to this problem.

It is necessary to note here that I know of one additional Chinese manuscript of the *Ratnarāṣi* from Dunhuang, found in the Paris collection of manuscripts recovered by Pelliot and registered there as Fond Pelliot chinois 3348.¹ According to the recent catalogue, this manuscript covers from the beginning of the *Ratnarāṣi* up to the middle of chapter three. I examined a microfilm of this manuscript, but it was apparently photographed under a light so strong that absolutely all the writing, which is in red according to the catalogue, and evidently faint, has been totally washed out. I was completely unable to decipher the manuscript. Perhaps at a later time someone will be able to obtain better photographs or to examine the actual manuscript in Paris and collate it with the edition printed in the present study. It will be interesting at that time to compare the readings of the Paris manuscript especially with our manuscript A.

In addition to these old and valuable manuscript materials, we also have at our disposal of course numerous printed versions of the canon. The usual starting point of any study of canonical Buddhist Chinese texts is the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*, and I have of course utilized this edition. But while the *Taishō* is sufficient for casual reference, any serious text-critical study of a work must confirm the *Taishō*'s readings independently, not only because of the possibility of misprints in the *Taishō* edition but also because, for example, the very valuable *Jisha* edition was not available at the time the *Taishō* was compiled, and so its readings are not represented. Ideally an editor or translator should consult as many editions as possible, but access to all but those which have been reprinted is for all intents and purposes impossible. For the remainder anyone without access to

¹ See Soymié 1983: 281, serial number 3348. The text is said to cover from *juan* 82 through 113 (the end of which is missing) of the *Mahāratnakūṭa*.

numerous academic and monastic libraries in Japan and China — in other words, almost everyone — is limited to the notations of variant readings offered in the printed editions.

As far as I know there is no one up-to-date and reliable guide to the canonical Chinese xylographic and manuscript editions of Buddhist texts, what are known as the *Dazang-jing* 大藏經 or *Yiqie-jing* 一切經.¹ Much information is available however scattered here and there in various publications, mostly of course in Chinese but also in Japanese and to some extent in English and French. I am far from being a specialist in this area, and therefore in the following I have merely attempted, primarily for my own clarification, to outline some basics of what is known about the various editions and their interrelations. I have never seen a *stemma* of the Chinese canonical collections, the relations between which are in any case extremely complicated.² One crucial complicating factor, over and above the divergent sources of texts used as the basis for any given edition, is the fact that the editions are organized and ordered in many cases on the basis of sūtra catalogues, which were of course compiled as normative documents. (In this respect, of course, the situation with the Kanjurs in Tibet was identical, the fundamental difference being that the number of catalogues upon which different traditions were based was apparently smaller in Tibet.)

In compiling the present edition I have consulted the following canonical editions:³

¹ The closest one might come is Cai 1983. One should also see Daizōkai 1964 and Chikusa 1993, the relevant sections of Ono 1932-35, supplement, and in Western languages Demiéville 1924: 181-218, 1934-36, 1953, Pelliot 1953: 88-93, and Ch'en 1951. It is to be regretted that Tsien 1985 is very weak on this material (and on Buddhist related matters in general), and almost totally derivative. One also does not find much useful and relevant information in Wu 1950.

² See however the second chart in Cai 1983, after page 622.

³ It should be remembered that there is a certain amount of variance in the conversion of traditional Chinese (lunar, reign and cyclical) dates to those of the modern calendar. Sometimes, therefore, sources disagree by one year in their conversions of dates. I have not made an effort to rectify all the dates, and the reader is asked to keep this in mind.

T: The *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 (1924-34). The second printing of the Korean Tripitaka is the text taken as the main basis for the *Taishō*.¹ The reproduction of this Korean text is not exact, however, as the footnotes to the present edition show. The *Ratnarāṣi* is found in volume 11, pages 638c-648a.

C: The *Jin* 金 edition (1149-1173). Formerly this was commonly known as the *Zhaocheng-zang* 趙城藏, but new research apparently indicates that the name *Jiezhou Tianning-si Jin-zang* 解州天寧寺金藏 is to be considered more correct.² Discovered in 1933, this edition has been reprinted very recently. However, only the first half (first *juan*) of the *Ratnarāṣi* is available, since the second roll was too badly damaged to be reproduced. The second roll is supplanted in the reprint edition from the Korean canon. The text is found in volume 9, pages 391b-408b. A sample of the damaged second *juan* is shown on 408c.³

J: The *Jisha* 磧砂 edition (1231-1322). The complete name of the edition is the *Pingjiang-fu Jisha Yansheng Chanyuan-ban* 平江府磧砂延聖禪院版. The work on this edition was interrupted by fire and consequently extended over a number of years. The date of the engraving of the *Ratnakūṭa* section is recorded as the seventh month of 1231, and was the first section carved.⁴ The *Ratnarāṣi* is found in volume 6, pages 159a-168a.⁵

K: The Korean edition 高麗 (1236-51). The blocks for the *Ratnarāṣi* were

¹ Chikusa 1993: 12.

² Cai 1983: 495-98, Ono 1932-35, supplement: 728b-29b, Cai 1976 (the second half of the book is an introduction to and catalogue of the edition), *Daizōkai* 1964: 42-43, Chikusa 1993: 13. A few early remarks on this edition were offered by Demiéville 1934-36.

³ *Zhonghua Dazangjing* 中華大藏經 (Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju chubun 中華書局出版). Volume 9, published 1985.

⁴ A supplement was added to the edition, the latest colophon of which is dated 1363, according to Demiéville 1953: 134. See Ono 1932-35, supplement pages 846b-49b, *Daizōkai* 1964: 63-65, Ch'en 1951: 213-14, and Chikusa 1993: 16. Xinwenfeng Editorial Committee 1988 is a catalogue of this edition.

⁵ Yanshengyuan Dazangjing-ju 延聖院大藏經局 ed., *Songban Jisha Dazangjing* 宋版磧砂大藏經 (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubun 新華豐出版, 1987).

carved in 1240.¹ This is the second Korean edition, the first having been destroyed in 1232. This edition served as the basis not only for the Taishō edition but before that for the *Shukusatsu*- 縮刷, *Manji*- 卍 and *Zoku-zōkyō* 續藏經.² The *Ratnarāṣi* is found in volume 6, pages 882b-896b.

In the notes of the Taishō and *Jin* editions there is reference, further, to other editions the readings of which I quote on this basis alone, without any examination of the editions themselves.³ These editions are:

F: The *Fangshan yunju-si shijing* 房山雲居寺石經 “edition” (1055-1056).⁴

The carving of this collection on thousands of stone plates extended over approximately 600 years (605-1094, or even later). In some cases the texts preserved in stone in this edition are our oldest source for the Chinese texts of Buddhist sūtras. This edition is closely related to the Kitan-Liao 契丹遼 edition.⁵ The latter is apparently also the basis for the second Korean edition.

¹ According to Lancaster and Park 1979: 23. The text is published as *Koryō daejangkyōng* 高麗大藏經 (Seoul: Dongguk University 東國大學, 1976). See Paik 1951 for further details in English.

² More fully the titles of these editions are: *Dainippon kōtei shukoku daizōkyō* 大日本校訂縮刻大藏經, *Dainippon kōtei kinten zōkyō* 大日本校訂訓點藏經, and *Dainippon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經.

³ It is obvious that these are not always completely reliable or comprehensive. C quotes in its notes F, J, K, M, N, Q, Y, and Z. Of these the Taishō also quotes M and Y, and I have examined J and K myself. There is enough disagreement between the quotations in C and the Taishō, and between C and the actual texts of J and K, to make us seriously question the utility of the entire apparatus. In the absence of any alternative, however, I have reported everything, without being able to promise that there does not remain much more which an examination of the originals would reveal.

⁴ I have given the dates of the carving of the *Ratnarāṣi* itself. The whole *Ratnakūṭa* was carved from 1042-1056. For these dates see Zhonghua Fojiao Xiehui 1978: 99, and Beijing Tushuguan Jinshizu and Zhonghua Fojiao Tushu Wenwuguan Shijing-zu 1987: 317-318. According to Vaudescal 1914: 387, the 120 *juan* of the *Ratnakūṭa* were engraved on 360 plaques of stone.

⁵ The Fangshan “edition” (rather, collection of texts) has been the object of a profound study by Vaudescal 1914, to which the interested reader should be directed first. See also Demiéville 1924: 210-11, Huang 1986, and Chikusa 1993: 14-15. One may also consult Zhonghua Fojiao Xiehui 1978, with plates which well illustrate the wonder of this edition, and Beijing Tushuguan Jinshizu and Zhonghua Fojiao Tushu Wenwuguan Shijing-zu 1987 for detailed historical materials. See also Tsien 1985: 28-29, and note 1 on 29. Lancaster 1989 is interesting, and offers an accessible discussion of the motivations for creating the collection, but the author seems to have been unaware of the studies of Vaudescal, and to have little used recent Chinese research.

G: The *Kaiyuan* 開元 edition. This is quoted in the Taishō edition as the Palace 宮 edition,¹ and is also known as the *Fuzhou-ban* 福州版. There are, however, actually two distinct editions which are conflated under this one title. The first is the *Chongning* 崇寧 edition (1080-1112), also known as the *Chongning wanshou dazang* 崇寧萬壽大藏, the *Dongchan-si-ben* 東禪寺本, and the *Dongchan dengjue-yuan-ben* 東禪等覺院本.² The second is the *Pilu* 毘盧 edition (1113-1148).³

M: The *Ming* 明 edition (1589-1677). Although this is commonly referred to also as the Northern Ming edition, actually it is not, since that edition belongs to the Yongle 永樂 period (specifically 1410-1440). The present edition is actually a re-edition of that Northern edition carried out by the monk Mizang Daokai 密藏道開.⁴ It is also known as the *Jingshan-zang* 徑山藏, *Wanli-ban* 萬曆版 or the *Jiaying-zang* 嘉興藏.⁵

N: The Southern Ming 南藏 edition (1372-?). Also called the *Nanjing Dabaoen-si-ban* 南京大報恩寺版.

Q: The *Qing* 清 edition (1735-1738). This is also known as the *Long-zang* 龍

¹ The sigla in the Taishō itself, however, indicate that 宮 stands for the "Old Sung edition," which is dated 1104-1148. (1104 is the year in which the Chongning edition received its name.) The reason for this is because the Taishō takes as the basic text the *Pilu* edition, supplementing missing materials from the *Chongning* edition, as pointed out by Ono 1932-35, supplement page 812a, and by Cai 1983: 471. (宮 stands for *Kunaishō* 宮內省, since the texts are found in the library of the Department of the Imperial Household). There is no indication on a case by case basis of which edition was used.

² See Cai 1983: 469-70, Daizōkai 1964: 43-47, Ogawa 1958: 274, Ye 1937: 32, Ono 1932-35, supplement pages 675a, 781b-87a, Demiéville 1924: 184, and Ch'en 1951: 209-10.

³ See Ogawa 1958: 274, Ono 1932-35, supplement pages 675a, 808a-12a. The date of completion is given as 1172 by Ye 1937: 32 and Cai 1983: 471-73. See also Daizōkai 1964: 47-50, and Ch'en 1951: 210. This is evidently the edition referred to by Demiéville 1924: 184 as the *Kaiyuan-si* edition. Since Michihata 1966: 175 refers only to one edition, and gives the date of completion as 1146, with a section of Chan materials added in 1172, he is evidently referring to this edition.

⁴ The Chan monk Mizang Daokai 密藏道開 seems to have been involved around 1581 in an attack on the "heretical" teachings of the Wuwei-jiao 無為教, his attacks being contained in a work he wrote discussing extracanonical scriptures, the *Zangyi jingshu* 藏逸經書, published in 1597. See Overmyer 1976: 114, and notes. See also Tsukamoto 1975: 186-93, and Ogasawara 1967: 223.

⁵ See Cai 1983: 505-19, Ono 1932-35, supplement page 808, Nanjio 1883: xxii-xxiii, Daizōkai 1964: 68-74.

藏. It is based primarily on the Northern Ming edition.¹

S: The *Song* 宋 edition (1132-?). This is more fully known as the *Huzhou siqi yuanjue chanyuan-ban* 湖州思溪圓覺禪院版. To prevent confusion with Z this is also called the *Qian siqi-zang* 前思溪藏.²

Y: The *Yuan* 元 edition (1278-1290). More fully known as the *Hangzhou nanshan dapuning-si-ban* 杭州南山大普寧寺版, or even the *Hangzhou luyuxian baiyunzong nanshan dapuning-si-ban* 杭州路餘杭縣白雲宗南山大普寧寺版.³

Z: The *Zifu* 資福 edition (1239?). Also more fully known as the *Anjizhou siqi fabao zifu chanyuan-ban* 安吉州思溪法寶資福禪院版. Apparently an expanded extension of S. Also called the *Hou siqi-zang* 後思溪藏.⁴

Chikusa has classified the Song and Yuan period editions into three groups (or “genealogies,” *keifu* 系譜) based on their physical presentation.⁵ The first group includes the Korean (K) and *Jin* (C) editions. The second comprises the *Fangshan shijing* (F), and the so-far unavailable Kitan-Liao edition. The third group is split into two primary classes, the first including the two *Kaiyuan* editions (G), the second the two

¹ See Ye 1937: 34, Cai 1983: 499-504, Ono 1932-35, supplement page 913b.

² See Ch'en 1951: 210-11, in which he discusses S and Z. Demiéville 1924: 185 treated the two, S and Z, as one, but changed his mind in 1953: 133, mostly based on the researches of Ono Genmyō. See Ono 1932-35, supplement pages 830b-31b. If I understand him correctly, Itō 1982 proposes to date the edition 1126-1132. The Taishō table of sigla indicates that their Song edition dates to 1239, which would make it Z rather than S. I am not sure where the error lies, but for the time being keep the sigla I have established. It is possible however that the notations of S and Z may be confused.

³ These are the many different versions of the dates of the *Puning* edition: Ch'en 1951: 213 has 1278-1294, Michihata 1966: 175-76 has 1269-1285, Ye 1937: 33 has 1269-1286, Demiéville 1934-36: 113 has 1278-1290. In Demiéville 1924: 185, note 5, the following opinions are quoted: 1277-1290, 1278-1289, and from 1276. Ono 1932-35, supplement pages 676a and 863b-66a dates it 1278-1290 (at the former location he misprints both dates, but the cyclical dates he gives correspond to these years). See also Demiéville 1924: 185-87. The colophon of *juan* 17 of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* is dated 1281 according to Ono 1932-35, supplement page 864a. 寧 is also written 甯.

⁴ The date is after Cai 1983: 479. Ye 1937: 33 gives 1175, while Ch'en 1951: 211 refers to the opinion that the edition dates to between 1237-1252. See Ono 1932-35, supplement pages 812a-15b.

⁵ Chikusa 1993: 17-18, and the unpaginated table at the end. Chikusa takes no account of the Ming and Qing dynasty editions in his classification, and provides dates in only a few rare cases.

Siqi editions (S and Z), the *Jisha*, and the *Yuan* edition (Y). The first group, carved in Chengdu 成都 in Sichuan 四川 province, is considered “rustic” by Chikusa, while the second group is based on the most orthodox manuscript canons of the Tang capital of Chang’an 長安. The majority of the Dunhuang manuscripts, Chikusa maintains, also belong to this latter group.¹

I mentioned above that it would be difficult to construct a *stemma* for these editions. Despite the fact that there is a considerable amount of historical information about these editions available, including in some cases the knowledge of how and by whom their printing was funded and so on, the degree of stemmatic contamination coupled with factors such as the influence of the catalogues upon which the organization of the editions was based will make the writing of a comprehensive history of these materials painstaking.² It goes without saying, in any case, that this task must be left to Sinologists, among whose number I do not count myself. I have endeavored, nevertheless, to try to clarify for the reader as well as for myself the general picture of the history of the canonical materials which serve as the basis for the edition I am printing here. I would hope that this perhaps insufficiently informed effort will motivate better informed scholars to correct the picture I have haltingly sketched, and to provide us with a reliable and up to date survey of the materials in question.

Now that we have treated the sources of the readings quoted in the edition, we may turn to a closer look at the characters themselves. There are a number of graphic variants in the different editions I have examined. Not being a specialist in the Chinese

¹ Chikusa also points out that the texts signalled in the Taishō with the siglum 聖, that is the Nara period manuscripts kept in the Shōsōin 正倉院, also called the *Shōgozō* 聖語藏 (written 聖護藏 by Chikusa), likewise belong to this lineage. It seems to me possible, therefore, that the newly discovered Nanatsudera manuscripts may also be connected with this tradition.

² Silvio Vita of the University of Rome is presently preparing a study on *Daizōkyō* for the *Hōbōgirin*. This should deal with many of these matters.

script, I have sometimes been unsure as to which variants to register as legitimate variants, and which might be considered only graphic options, having no effect on the sense or nuance.¹ In general it is possible to state that the Taishō edition, although itself far from regular in its own treatment of graphic variants, has tended very much to level the forms likely to have been found in its sources, printing modern standard and non-abbreviated characters in almost all cases. Similarly, the editors of the Jin edition have obviously not noted graphic variants in their notes. As I will detail below, although there is a tendency of some sources to utilize abbreviated or simplified forms of characters, I have in general printed full “correct” forms when possible. That such a procedure is not necessarily historically justifiable might be argued by reference to a manuscript of as early as 406 C.E. in which some “simplified” forms are already found.² I have nevertheless tended to follow the practice of the Taishō editors, to some extent under the assumption that scholars who are particularly interested in the Chinese script will, naturally, turn to the original sources rather than any printed version I might provide. Moreover, I have been limited by the characters that are available in the standard Japanese computerized font sets (JIS characters), augmented by certain custom-made characters. As examples of the types of things I am talking about, I may refer to the following examples: the element 口 in characters such as the 員 of 損 or the 兌 of 說 is regularly written 厶, so that the standard form is strictly speaking not 說 but rather 説. In all pre-modern texts, I believe, the writing of what looks like 湏 for 須 and 得 for 得 is common, but in fact the latter at least is probably not a “variant” but rather due to the type of purely graphic confusion between the 彳 and the “water radical” caused by evolving styles of script, as pointed out

¹ For a general overview of the history of the standard, formal characters called *kai* 楷, see Fujieda 1981.

² See plate one, page 293, in Fujieda 1981.

by Fujieda.¹ We also find a certain flexibility in the use of 𠂔 for the usual 𠂔, and 𠂔 for 𠂔 and vice versa, such as with 役 and 𠂔,² or 𠂔 for 𠂔. Likewise, although not due to any graphic confusion as such, in J 𠂔 is used for 𠂔, while A, C and K prefer 𠂔.

According to the relevant entries in Morohashi's dictionary, these three characters are merely graphic variants for one another. Other types of variants include B writing 𠂔 for 𠂔 and 𠂔 for 𠂔, both of which again, according to Morohashi, are known variants.³ As a different type of example, we normally find 𠂔, the simplified form of 𠂔, or 𠂔 for 𠂔, 𠂔 for 𠂔, and so on, and in fact here and there simplified forms of many characters regularly occur, often mixed together with the full classical forms in apparent free variation. I have made little effort to note these differences, which have no impact on the meaning but would certainly have to be taken into account in any comprehensive paleographical discussion of the Chinese sources. As other examples we may note that B, J, and K generally have 𠂔 for 𠂔, and J and K write 𠂔 for 𠂔, 𠂔 for 𠂔, 𠂔 for 𠂔, 𠂔 for 𠂔, 𠂔 for 𠂔, and A, J, and K have 𠂔 for 𠂔 and 𠂔 for 𠂔, while J, M, and Y have 𠂔 for 𠂔. In addition, A often writes 𠂔 for 𠂔, an old writing (found already in the *Zhongyong* 中庸).⁴ One list to which the interested reader might turn for comparison is that published in a Japanese study of the Longmen cave inscriptions.⁵ The great majority of the graphic variants I have encountered in the manuscript and woodblock editions are recorded in the table of variant characters provided for those stone inscriptions. To have listed all such graphic variants in the notes would have clogged the

¹ Discussed and illustrated in Fujieda 1981: 312. One will find in an appendix to Meiji Yamada et al. 1984 a helpful and interesting chart illustrating variant forms of characters found in the Korean edition of the Chinese canon (our K).

² See Morohashi 1955-60: 429 (1.644c).

³ See Morohashi 1955-60: 44212 (12.413b), and 17132, definition 2.1 (6.911c).

⁴ See Morohashi 1955-60: 38642, definition 9 (10.1077d).

⁵ Mizuno and Nagahiro 1941, appendix 2. The appendix is credited to Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆, Mizuno Seiichi 水野清一 and Kasuga Reichi 春日礼智. Another list which contains some, but again not all, of the variant forms is found in Zhulin 1988.

pages of the edition with material of dubious utility, and it goes without saying that the variants reported in the notes to the Taishō and Jin editions contain no such readings. I have therefore restricted the notes to reporting true variants *as I understand them*. I should repeat however that I have no special knowledge of Chinese paleography, and this aspect at least of the present work should be considered more than usually provisional.

On the other hand, I think the present edition well illustrates how much overconfidence has heretofore been placed in the Taishō edition. It is well known among specialists that the Taishō is rife with misprints, and that the punctuation is often misleading or outright wrong. The latter is easily compensated for, but the former requires a careful examination of other sources to control. There seems nevertheless to have been little willingness among most scholars so far, especially those concerned primarily with Indian texts, to go beyond the Taishō edition, perhaps in the belief that the textual tradition of Chinese materials is so good that few results would be obtained from the considerable effort which is required to collate other sources. I hope, however, that a careful examination of the present edition will show that such an attitude — we might even call it hubris — is perhaps not completely justifiable. It is certainly true that the reliability of the available Chinese materials is considerably better than that of comparable Tibetan canonical editions, for example. This should nevertheless not let us conclude that we may simply take the printed text at face value. Only further careful collations of other materials will show how far the present editions, chief among them the Taishō, stand truly in need of comprehensive correction.

Let us now turn to the sūtra proper, and its history in China. The Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāṣi*, as a part of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, is titled *Baoliangju-hui* 寶梁聚會 (in Japanese read *Hōryōju-e*), and the translation is attributed to Daogong 道龔 (Japanese Dōkyō). Since the *Ratnarāṣi* is included in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, it

has no extant independent colophon. It is likely that one was originally attached to the text, however, but this would have been discarded when the translation was incorporated into the collection by Bodhiruci in the early eighth century. We know that such a process must have taken place because in at least one instance a copy of a sūtra pre-dating the compilation of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection has survived, and it indeed has an independent colophon attached. This text, the *Maitreyamahāsimhanāda*, has been found in the Nanatsudera 七寺 in Nagoya in a late Heian period (1175-80) manuscript *Issaikyō*. The originals from which the texts in this *Issaikyō* were copied were brought from China to Japan before the compilation of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, and this accounts for the preservation of the pre-Bodhiruci versions of the texts. The case of the *Maitreyamahāsimhanāda* has been studied recently in considerable detail by the scholar most responsible for the Nanatsudera discoveries, Ochiai Toshinori.¹

Without a colophon or, as we will see, other supporting information, we must turn to the Chinese sūtra catalogues which refer to the translation of the *Ratnarāṣi* and to the translator. I notice these catalogues in chronological order, the date in the left-hand column:²

515: The *Chu sancang ji ji* 出三藏記集 has the following:³ “The *Baoliang-jing* in two *juan*. The above mentioned item is, in all, two *juan*. It was published by the Śramaṇa Shih Daogong during the time of the Emperor Jin Andi (397-419). — It is reported that he was from Liangzhou.”

¹ See Ochiai 1992. For a general discussion of the Nanatsudera materials in English see Ochiai 1991.

² Tokiwa 1938: 899-900 has mentioned the major catalogue references. He has also discussed the *Karunāpundarīka* translation attributed to Daogong, on which see below. A good introduction to the catalogues in general is Okabe 1980 (in English).

³ T. 2145 (LV) 11c6: 寶梁經二卷。右一部凡二卷。晉安帝時沙門釋道龔出, then in small characters: 傳云於涼州出。

- 594: The *Zhongjing mulu* I 衆經目錄 reads:¹ “The *Baoliang-jing* in two *juan*. It was translated by the Śramaṇa Daogong during the Jin period These twelve Vinaya texts are all the fixed set of single translations of Vinaya works.”
- 597: The *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記 has:² “The *Baoliang-jing* in two *juan*. Consult Daoan’s Catalogue on Hexi ... Published in Zhangye for the king of Hexi, Juqu.”³
- 602: The *Zhongjing mulu* II 衆經目錄 has only:⁴ “The *Baoliang-jing* in two *juan*. It was translated by the Śramaṇa Daogong during the Beiliang.”
- 664: The *Datang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 adds the detail that the text contains thirty leaves.⁵
- 664-5: The *Gujin yijing tuji* 古今譯經圖紀 has:⁶ “With an empty mind he roamed broadly spreading profit as the path. He translated it for the Hexi ruler in the Northern Liang between the Shenxi and Yong’an years, in Zhangye under the orders of Meng Sun.”
- 695: The *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄 has:⁷ “The *Baoliang-jing* in one section, two *juan*, forty-four leaves. It was translated by Daogong

¹ T. 2146 (LV) 139a27: 寶梁經二卷。晉世沙門道龔譯。Then at b7: 右一十二律並是衆律一譯定本。

² T. 2034 (XLIX) 84a7-9: 寶梁經二卷。見竺道祖河西錄 ... 於張掖爲河西王沮渠氏出。

³ The reference is to Juqu Mengsun 蒙遜, or his third son Mujian 牧犍. See Morohashi 1955-60: 6.1005c (17238.14-17).

⁴ T. 2147 (LV) 153a23: 寶梁經二卷。北涼世道龔譯。

⁵ T. 2149 (LV) 303c29 寶梁經二卷, 320a26: 寶梁經二卷三十紙。北涼道龔譯。See also 255b29-c3: 悲華經十卷。見古錄似是先譯龔更刪改。寶梁經二卷。見竺道祖河西錄。右二部合一十二卷。晉安帝世。沙門釋道龔於涼州爲河西王沮渠氏出, and 294a15-16: 寶梁經二卷三十紙。北涼道龔譯。In the *Zhongjing mulu* 衆經目錄 T. 2148 (LV) 185a18, dating to approximately 664, no additional information is added 寶梁經二卷三十紙。北涼世道龔譯。

⁶ T. 2151 (LV) 360b4-6: 沙門釋道龔。虛心廣運弘利爲道。以北涼河西王神璽 (or Song, Yuan, Ming 瑯) 永初 [read with *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 永安?] 年間於張掖爲蒙遜譯。悲華經一部十卷。寶梁經一部二卷。

⁷ T. 2153 (LV) 405a26-28: 寶梁經。一部二卷。四十四紙。右北涼道龔譯。出達摩辭多羅錄。又出長房錄。465c14: 寶梁經。一部二卷。四十四紙。

during the Beiliang. It is recorded in Dharmottara's catalogue,¹ and in [Fei] Changfang's catalogue [the *Lidai sanbao ji*]."

- 730: The *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄, the first catalogue published after the completion of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection by Bodhiruci, has:² "The *Baoliang-jing* in two *juan*. It is now entered as section forty-four in the *Ratnakūṭa*. See Zhu Daozu's Hexi catalogue³ and Sengyu's catalogue [the *Chu sancang ji ji*]. The *Karunapundarīka* is in ten *juan*. The third translation is the same text with the *Xianju-jing* 閑居經 of Dharmarakṣa, the [anonymous] *Da[cheng] Beifentuo-li-[jing]* 大[乘]悲分陀利[經], and the *Beihua-jing* 悲華經 of Dharmakṣema. [The *Lidai sanbao ji*] says to consult the Old Catalogue [which states that] this resembles the former translation. [Dao]gong newly revised and arranged [the text]. I suspect that the translation is Dharmakṣema's. These two texts together come to twelve *juan*. The first, the *Baoji-jing* in two *juan* is extant. The second, the *Beihua-jing* in ten *juan*, is lost. They were [translated by] the Śramaṇa Shih Daogong. With an empty mind he roamed broadly spreading profit as the path. During the period 401-411 of the Beiliang Hexi ruler it was translated at Zhangye under the orders of Meng Sun. [Daogong] translated two texts, the *Baoliang-jing*

¹ Also called the 法上錄, the 高齊衆經目錄 and the 高世衆經目錄. See Hayashiya 1941: 72.

² T. 2154 (LV) 519b19 and 23-25: 寶梁經. 二卷. 今編入寶積當第四十四會. 見竺道祖河西錄及僧祐錄. 悲華經. 十卷. 第三與法護閑居經及大悲分陀利曇無讖悲華經等同本. 房云見古錄. 似是先譯. 龔更刪改. 今疑即無讖出者是. 右二部一十二卷. 前寶積經一部二卷見存. 後悲華經一部十卷闕本. 沙門釋道龔. 虛心廣運弘利爲道. 以北涼河西王 (small character note: 蒙遜僭号) 永安年間於張掖爲蒙遜譯. 寶梁等經二部. At 586a26-29, in a listing of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, we find: 第四十四寶梁聚會二卷. 北涼沙門釋道龔譯. 勘同編入. 右舊譯單本. 當一百一十三卷及一百一十四. At 665c17-18 we have: 寶梁等經二卷. 北涼沙門道龔譯. 在第四十四會, and at 24-27 the statement that along with 22 other texts: "These texts are old translations in the *Mahāratnakūṭa*. The Tripiṭaka master Bodhiruci compared them with the Sanskrit originals, but he did not retranslate them and used them as is. So, they are collectively included in the whole, and deleted as separate items" 並是大寶積經諸會舊譯. 三藏菩提流志勘梵本同. 更不重繅直編會次. 即合入大部別者刪之. At 698a24 and 26-27 the text is again listed, with the information that it was included into the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection and that there is no alternate translation (無別本).

³ See Mochizuki 1932-36: 3885ab.

[and the lost *Karuṇapūṇḍarīka*].”

There are, of course, other later entries as well, but these add little to what the important sources quoted above reveal.¹

As we have seen in addition to the *Ratnarāśī*, the translation of at least one other text is attributed to Daogong. This is the *Karuṇapūṇḍarīka*.² Although it is not certain, the evidence seems to suggest that the attribution is probably false, and that the “lost” *Karuṇapūṇḍarīka* translation of Daogong is rather to be identified with the extant translation attributed to his more famous contemporary Dharmakṣema.³ These are the only notices usually given concerning Daogong (when he is mentioned at all). However, we should also draw attention to one entry in the *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄 which attributes to Daogong a translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*.⁴ This entry claims that Daogong translated the *Da mingdu-jing* 大明度經, and that this is mentioned already in the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記 of 597. The latter information is not correct and no such reference is found in the earlier catalogue, and in fact the whole attribution is very dubious, as has been noticed by Kajiyoshi Kōun in his monumental study of the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature.⁵ Moreover, Kajiyoshi has observed

¹ For example, the *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄, dating to the late 8th century, besides noting that the text is included at present as section 44 of the *Mahāratnakūṭa*, reproduces the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* exactly. T. 2157 (LV) 816b3-9. See also 914c14-17, 1004a1-2, and 1046b25 where the text is listed as part of the *Mahāratnakūṭa*. The *Kaiyuan shijiao-lu lüechu* 開元釋教錄略出 T. 2155 (LV) 746c10 and 12-13 is precisely T. 2154 (LV) 698a24 and 26-27.

² I mentioned above the observations of Tokiwa 1938 on Daogong in general. See also Isshi Yamada 1968: I.20, and note Tokiwa 1938: 388-89 and Hayashiya 1941: 225. . In addition to the remarks in the various entries cited above, see also the following: T. 2149 (LV) 255c16-17: 悲華經. 十卷. 第二出見道祖河西錄. 又古錄載是道龔已出雖歲 (some add 年) 不同等是涼州世出疑前譯未善故有兩分異似再續實. T. 2153 (LV) 391b6-8: 悲華經. 十卷. 初出. 右北涼沙門道龔爲河西王沮渠氏譯. 出長房錄. T. 2154 (LV) 629a20-23: 閑居經. 十卷. 西晉三藏竺法護譯. 第一譯. 悲華經. 十卷. 涼沙門道龔譯. 第三譯. 右二經同本. 前後四譯二存二闕.

³ This is also the conclusion of Sakaino 1935: 602.

⁴ T. 2153 (LV) 382a14-15: 大明度經. 一部四卷. 一百六紙. 右北涼沙門道龔於西源 [Ming, Song, Yuan 京 for 源] 譯. 出長房錄.

⁵ Kajiyoshi 1980: 57-58. Kajiyoshi's work was first published in 1944, but I have not had an opportunity to check if the present discussion is found in the first, unrevised, edition.

that the very same *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* on the preceding page has entered what is apparently the same *Da mingdu-jing* as a translation of Zhiqian 支謙, the translator to whom the text is normally and traditionally attributed.¹ No other catalogues pick up this reference of the *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* to the (or a) *Da mingdu-jing* as a translation of Daogong, and we can perhaps go no farther than Kajiyoshi who concluded that we have here nothing more than a confusion which should be deleted from the catalogue. It will remain to explain how such a confusion could have entered a catalogue in this way, or why the name of such an obscure translator as Daogong should have been selected (if deception was intended) or have happened (if by chance) into this entry. I am not totally convinced that we have only a freak accident, mostly based on my suspicion that the very name of Daogong was probably obscure enough to mitigate against any accidental writing of that name without any reason. But this too is mere supposition, and I must appeal to specialists for their suggestions with regard to this problem.

Given the information above, we can conclude that the *Ratnarāśi* was translated by a monk named Daogong, in Liangzhou, about 700 km. ESE of Dunhuang on the main road, in modern day Gansu province, right at the end of the fourth or at the very beginning of the fifth century. The *Shenxi* 神璽 period is 397-398, the *Yong'an* 永安 period 401-411. As far as I know, there are no biographies of Daogong, and we know next to nothing about him.² It is not clear if the *Karuṇapūṇḍarīka* attributed to him is attributed correctly, but this seems to be the less likely conclusion. It seems even less likely that the

¹ T. 2153 (LV) 381b20-22: 大明度經。一部四卷。或六卷。或名大明度無極經。一百六紙。右吳黃武年優婆塞支謙於涼州譯。出長房錄。 It is perhaps worth mentioning that the attribution to Zhiqian has been questioned by Lancaster 1969, whose statement (p. 246), however, that "The catalogues all agree that Chi Ch'ien [= Zhiqian] is the translator" should be revised.

² This was, I have lately noticed, also the conclusion of Bagchi 1927: 211. As far as I can tell from the relevant indices, Daogong is not mentioned in the Chinese dynastic histories either.

Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā translation is to be accepted as his.

While we may know little about the man, the time and place in which Daogong lived certainly placed him in the middle of one of the most productive, even explosive, periods in Chinese Buddhist history. So despite this paucity of information about the translator Daogong or the translation of the *Ratnarāśi* itself, we can mention a few of the illustrious monk-translators who are known to have been at work in the same region and at the same time as Daogong. A discussion is found in the *Gujin yijing tuji* 古今譯經圖紀, and this material has been summarized, although uncritically, by Bagchi.¹ The monk-translators listed as contemporaries or near contemporaries of Daogong, and residing in the same region, are Fazhong 法衆, Sengqietuo 僧伽陀, and Dharmakṣema 曇摩讖. The first two seem to have been of relatively little importance, and only one translation of the former of them, Fazhong from Turfan, seems to have survived (T. 1339). The latter, Sengqietuo, is credited with a now lost translation of the *Upāya-kauśalyajñānottarabodhisattvaparipṛcchā*, a sūtra included in the *Mahāratnakūṭa*.²

It would no doubt be possible to contextualize the translator's place in Chinese Buddhist history in considerable detail, but I leave this to those specialized in such matters, and instead turn to what we know of the further vicissitudes of Daogong's work in China. I have been able to trace a fair number of quotations from the *Baoliang-jing* in Chinese and Japanese Buddhist texts, some of the texts, of course, based obviously not directly on the sūtra itself but on other previous quotations of the sūtra. These are then, as it were, grandchild quotations, and references in the edition make clear when this is unequivocally the case. I have provided these quoted passages in the appropriate places

¹ T. 2151 (LV) 360b4-361a13, and Bagchi 1927: 211-23. See also Tokiwa 1938: 899-914.

² Hayashiya 1945: 502-11 has discussed the evidence of the sūtra catalogues in detail and concluded that the attribution is, in fact, false. For French translations of the hagiographies of Dharmakṣema and other near contemporaries such as Buddhavarman and Juqu Jingsheng 沮渠京聲, see Shih 1968: 98-107, 119-20.

in the edition of the Chinese text, but to illustrate perhaps more clearly what we are talking about I list the texts and their dates of composition (or the dates of their authors) here.¹

1	630 C.E.	道宣	四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 T. 1804.
2	643-712 C.E.	法藏	梵網經菩薩戒本疏 T. 1813.
3	656-683? C.E.	道世	諸經要集 T. 2123.
4	668 C.E.	道世	法苑珠林 T. 2122.
5	753- C.E.	大賢	梵網經古述記 T. 1815.
6	956 C.E.	觀靜	孔雀經音義 T. 2244.
7	1019 C.E.	道誠	釋氏要覽 T. 2127.
8	1048-1116 C.E.	元照	四分律行事鈔資持記 T. 1805.
9	1254 C.E.	良忠	選擇傳弘決疑鈔 T. 2610.
10	1318 C.E.	凝然	梵網戒本疏日珠鈔 T. 2247.
11	1689-1775 C.E.	萬仞道坦	佛祖正傳禪戒鈔 T. 2601.

Let us look at the distribution of the quotations, and their mutual relations. The following passages of the text are quoted:

I.2:	6 (full quotation), 7 (summary).
I.10:	1 (close paraphrase), 4 (quotation), 8 (allusion).
I.11:	1 (paraphrase), 4 (quotation).
I.12	4 (quotation).
I.13	4 (quotation).
I.15:	4 (paraphrase).
II.3	4 (quotation).
II.11	4 (quotation).
II.23	4 (quotation).
III.1	4 (quotation).
III.2	4 (quotation).
III.5	4 (quotation).
III.8	4 (quotation).
IV.1:	1 (paraphrase), 2 (quotation), 3 = 4 (quotation), 7 (paraphrase).

¹ I do not consider here the quotations included in the Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. The relation of this text to the *Ratnarāśi* will be discussed below.

- IV.2: 3 = 4 (quotation).
 IV.10: 1 (paraphrase), 2, 4, 5 based directly on 1. 3 = 4 (quotation), 10 (paraphrase), 9 (allusion).
 IV.11: 1 ≈ 2 ≈ 4 (paraphrase), 5 (paraphrase), 3 = 4 (quotation).
 IV.12: 1 = 2 = 4 (paraphrase), 3 = 4 (quotation), 10 (paraphrase).
 IV.13: 3 = 4 (paraphrase).
 IV.14: 3 = 4 (paraphrase).
 IV.15: 3 = 4 (quotation).
 IV.16: 3 = 4 (quotation).
 IV.17: 3 = 4 (abbreviated quotation).
 IV.20: 3 = 4 (paraphrase and quotation), 11 (quotation).
 V.3: 4 (quotation).
 VI.7: 8 (quotation).¹
 VII.11: 1 (paraphrase).

At least if one were to judge such things on the basis of the frequency of quotation alone, it seems that while the *Ratnarāṣi* cannot be considered to have been famous or highly influential in China or Japan, it does seem to have exercised some influence on a few thinkers, especially those concerned with matters of monastic discipline. Chief among these were the famous Vinaya master Daoxuan 道宣 and his less famous contemporary Daoshi 道世, two scholars who in fact received their higher ordination together (in 615). It is therefore perhaps no surprise that they both noticed the same text to which others seem not to have paid the same attention. Daoshi seems to have been especially interested in the sūtra, which he quotes at some length. Among the other scholars who also noticed the *Ratnarāṣi* are the extremely famous Tang dynasty scholar Fazang 法藏 (643-712), the Korean monk Taehyōn 大賢, the Japanese Shingon monk Kanjō 觀靜, Daocheng 道誠, Yuanzhao 元照 (1048-1116), who was himself a member of the Vinaya (Lü 律) sect, the Japanese Jōdo patriarch Ryōchū 良忠 (1199-1287), the Kegon scholar

¹ It is possible that there is an allusion to this passage in T. 1804 (XL) 143c7.

Gyōnen 凝然 (1240-1321), and the Sōtō Zen scholar Banjin Dōtan 萬仞道坦 (1689-1775). What is particularly interesting is the distribution of the quotations, which (with the exception of the extensive quotations by Daoshi) tend to concentrate almost exclusively on passages concerned with the disposition of monastic property.

The *Ratnarāśi* is also noticed by two texts which are concerned with the vocabulary of Chinese Buddhist texts. The first is the *Yiqiejing Yinyi* 一切經音義 of Xuanying 玄應, dating to 649. This text quotes and discusses three terms from the *Ratnarāśi* (at III.14, IV.15, and VII.5). The *Yiqiejing Yinyi* 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 is a somewhat later work (783-807) which treats altogether forty terms from the *Ratnarāśi*. In several places both these texts cite slightly different readings than are found in the text at present, or readings found in only a few editions.

Finally we come to the case of a paraphrase of the *Ratnarāśi* in a well-known and important work. The late sixth century *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀 of Zhiyi 智顗 (538-598), an extremely influential text, contains a single “quotation” from a 寶梁經.¹ This passage is also cited in two Japanese Tendai works, the ninth century *Taizō kongō bodaishin giryaku mondō-shō* 胎藏金剛菩提心義略問答抄 and the tenth century *Ōjō Yōshu* 往生要集, the latter explicitly on the basis of the *Mohe zhiguan*.² The passage seems to be a somewhat garbled paraphrase of some key ideas of the *Ratnarāśi*, although I have a hard time imagining that anyone who had direct access to the sūtra itself could

¹ T. 1911 (XLVI) 10a1-13: 寶梁經云。比丘不修比丘法大千無睡處況受人供養。六十比丘悲泣白佛。我等乍死不能受人供養。佛言。汝起慚愧心。善哉。善哉。一比丘白佛。何等比丘能受供養。佛言。若在比丘數修僧業得僧利者。是人能受供養。四果四向是僧數。三十七品是僧業。四果是僧利。比丘重白佛。若發大乘心者復云何。佛言。若發大乘心求一切智不墮^{*}數不修業不得利能受供養。比丘驚問。云何是人能受供養。佛言。是人受衣用敷大地受搏食若須彌山。亦能畢報施主之恩。當知小乘之極果不及大乘之初心。 *Donner and Stevenson 1993: 205, note 332, seem to suggest emending the character 墮 to 隨. (I suppose this on the basis of their English translation, as I do not have access to the materials to which they refer for the emendation.)

² T. 2397 (LXXV) 479a24-b6 and T. 2682 (LXXXIV) 50c21-51a4. It is natural to suspect that the former passage is also based on the *Mohe zhiguan*, but I have not looked into the question.

have come up with the following passage as a precis. We may translate the passage as follows:¹

Monks who do not practice in accord with the proper practices of the monk have not so much as a place to spit in the thousand times many thousand worlds, not to speak of being able to receive offerings from others. Sixty monks came piteously weeping to the Buddha, and said: "Even though we might die, we will not accept offerings from others." The Buddha said: "You have produced some idea of shame and modesty. Good! Good!" One monk said to the Buddha: "Which monks are able to receive offerings?" The Buddha said: "If among the assembly of monks there are those who practice monastic duties and obtain the benefits of monasticism, these persons may receive offerings."²

The monks again said to the Buddha: "How about if one were to raise the aspiration for the Great Vehicle?" The Buddha said: "If one raises the aspiration for the Great Vehicle and seeks omniscience, [even] not following the assembly, not cultivating duties, and not obtaining benefits, still one will be able to obtain offerings." The monks were surprised, and asked: "How is it that these people may obtain offerings?" The Buddha said: "If these people obtain robes large enough to spread over the entire earth, or if they receive balls of food as large as Mount Sumeru, they will still be able to completely repay the generosity of the donor."³

Before moving on to other topics, we may remark that there are, in addition to those materials so far cited (and those other references I have no doubt overlooked), also several texts which appeal to a so-called **Ratnarāśisūtra*, but apparently in error. We will treat these passages in detail below.

¹ I recently discovered that an English translation of the first chapter of the *Mohe zhiguan* has just been published: Donner and Stevenson 1993. This contains the passage from the *Ratnarāśi* on pages 204-5. I have followed these scholars in taking the passage in the middle of the quotation, and the last sentence, to be Zhiyi's glosses. The English translation I first made I have modified somewhat in the light of their rendering, but in some cases I still prefer my own understanding.

² Here is inserted Zhiyi's comment: The four fruits and the four preliminary stages are the assembly of monks. The thirty seven limbs of awakening are the monastic duties. The four fruits are the monks' benefits.

³ Here is added Zhiyi's comment: You should know that even the highest fruit of the Inferior Vehicle does not approach [the fruit of] the first aspiration for the Great Vehicle.

We have seen how Chinese and Japanese authors noticed the *Ratnarāṣi*. I have made no examination of Tibetan materials in which the sūtra may be quoted, but I do know of two texts in which, inter alia, it is discussed. The *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection has been the subject of two indexical tables of contents, one authored by a Tibetan scholar and the other by a Mongolian writing in Tibetan. The first author is Bo dong paṇ chen Phyogs las nnam rgyal (1375-1450),¹ and the second is Cha har dge bshes Blo bzang tshul khriṃs (1740-1810). The work of the first scholar is called *Dkon rtsegs le'u 'bum gyi mdo 'grel*, and concerning the *Ratnarāṣi* it says the following:²

Now I shall explain the *Ratnarāṣisūtra*. There [in that text] the introduction (**nidāna*) is set in order with *These words [have I thus heard]*, and so on [I.1]. In explicating the fundamental elements of the teaching, the renunciation of the śramaṇa is taught in general with the words *Then Kāśyapa [spoke] to the Blessed One*, and so on [I.7]. The excellences of the monk are taught specifically with the words *Kāśyapa, [people say] "Monk"*, and so on [II.1]. The practices of the caṇḍāla monk are given with the words *Kāśyapa. In that regard the monk*, and so on [III.1]. The practices of the supervisory monk are given with the words *Then, Blessed One, how [shall] the supervisory [monk]*, and so on [IV.1]. The practices of the wilderness dwelling monk are given with the words *Blessed One. The wilderness dweller*, and so on [V.1]. The practices of the alms begging monk are given with the words *The alms begging monk*, and so on [VI.1]. The practices of the monk who wears rag robes are given with the words *Kāśyapa. The monk*

¹ This author seems to have been mis-identified by Dantinne 1983: 35, note 182. See Tucci 1980: 293, who gives the dates as 1375-1451. I have followed the indication in the Library of Congress cataloging of his works, which I suppose to be due to Gene Smith (?).

² Phyogs las nnam rgyal 1970: folios 29a1-b1:
da ni rin chen phung po'i mdo bshad par bya ste / de la gleng gzhis lus nnam par bzhag pa ni / 'di skad zhes sogs so // chos dngos gzhis yan lag bshad pa la / dge sbyong gi spang pa'ang spyir stan pa ni / de nas bcom ldan 'das la 'od bsrung zhes sogs so // dge slong gi mchog khyad par du bshad pa ni / 'od bsrung dge slong zhes sogs so // dge slong gdol pa'i tshul ni / 'od bsrung de la dge slong zhes sogs so // dge slong zhal lta byed pa'i tshul ni / de nas bcom ldan 'das la ji lta bus zhal ta zhes sogs so // dge slong dgon pa pa'i tshul ni / bcom ldan 'das dge slong dgon pa zhes sogs so // dge slong bsod snyoms spyod pa'i tshul ni dge slong bsod snyoms zhes sogs so // dge slong phyag dar khrod pa'i tshul ni / 'od bsrung de la dge slong phyag dar zhes sogs so // 'dzin cing rdzogs pa'i tshul ni / de nas bcom ldan 'das zhes pa nas / chos kyi nnam grags 'dir zhes sogs so // rin chen phung po'i mdo 'grel rdzogs so // //

who wears rag robes, and so on [VII.1]. The practice of accepting [the sūtra] and the conclusion are given from the words *Then the Blessed One* to the words *Here in this discourse on doctrine* and so on [VII.26]. The commentary on the **Ratna-rāśisūtra* is completed.

As can be seen from this brief passage, while the “commentary” does give a very rough outline of the contents of the sūtra, it can hardly be said to be precise, and what is more, it is nearly if not totally impossible to identify which passages are actually being referred to by the quotation of such uncharacteristic phrases as “Then the Blessed One.” This is true for the treatment of all the texts in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* in this “commentary.” Some texts, it is true, receive a more detailed treatment, but in general it is hard to understand what use such a guide would have been to those who were themselves unfamiliar with the materials.

The second text, the *'Phags pa mdo sde dkon brtsegs kyi [d]kar chag brjed byang* (Memorandum indexical catalogue of the *Ratnakūṭa*), is even less precise. It reads:¹

**Ratnarāśi Heap of Jewels sūtra.* On the Vulture Peak, [preached under] the interrogation of Kāśyapa, it teaches the defining characteristics [through which one might recognize] good religious actions. [The chapters are:] The Chapter on the Śramaṇa [1], The Chapter on the Monk [2], The Chapter the Outcaste-like Śramaṇa [3], The Chapter on the Supervisor [4], The Chapter on the

¹ Tenzin 1972: folio 24a1-4:

rad narā shi rin po che'i phung po zhes bya ba'i mdo / bya rgod phung po'i rir / 'od srung gis zhus / dge spyod gi rgyu mtshan sogs bstan pa

(1)	<u>dge spyong gi le'u /</u>
(2)	<u>dge slong gi le'u /</u>
(3)	<u>dge spyong gdol ba lta bu'i le'u /</u>
(4)	<u>zhal ta byed pa'i le'u /</u>
(5)	<u>dgon pa pa'i le'u /</u>
(6)	<u>bsod snyoms pa'i le'u /</u>

bam gnyis / mdo 'dir / 'bru'i nang na ma smin pa / mi grung pa / 'ongs med pa / 'bru 'dra ba dag ni shin te zhes bya bar gsungs pa ste / rab byung rnams la mkho che ba'i gsung mang du yod / shog brgya dang don gsum par rdzogs /

As is obvious from the page number references and other indicators, this index is directly based on the Peking edition of the Kanjur.

Wilderness Dweller [5], and The Chapter on the Alms Beggar [6].¹ Two bam po. In the sūtra [III.13] it is said: "Amongst the grain there are some that look like grain but are not ripe, are not vigorous, do not bear fruit, and these are called weeds." And there are many [other such] expressions necessary for renunciants. It finishes on page 173.

In this case too, the way the *Ratnarāṣi* is treated by this catalogue is more or less typical of the whole text. These two Tibetan texts are interesting for us not so much for any light they shed on the sūtra texts we are studying as for the fact, for which their very existence provides evidence, that some Tibetan and Mongolian authors took the time and effort to read through the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection and compile guides to it.² In general one gets the strong impression from most Tibetan authors who quote or refer to sūtra materials that they rarely do so at first hand, mostly relying on compilations such as the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, or on quotations found in other works such as those of Candrakīrti or Tsong kha pa. The existence of these two texts — and there may be more with which I am not yet familiar — show that this approach was not the only one taken to sūtra materials by Tibetan scholars.

Indic Materials

I have mentioned above that we possess a significant portion of the *Ratnarāṣi* in Sanskrit in quotations in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. The quoted sections are as follows: I.8-9, 1416, IV.2-6, 9-12, 14-17, V.5-6, 11-15, 17-19, 21, VI.2-5, 9-12. These sections are also found in the Tibetan and Chinese translations of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. In some places the Sanskrit is abbreviated in comparison with the Tibetan text. In a few of these cases the Tibetan may represent an expanded state of the text, but in others it is more likely that

¹ The seventh, unnamed, chapter is ignored in this enumeration.

² I am completing editions of these two texts, which I hope to publish in the near future.

Śāntideva merely paraphrased. I have quoted the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* according to the edition of Bendall, which is generally believed to be reliable. A recent look at Braarvig's edition of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, however, has shaken my confidence in Bendall's readings. Braarvig examined the manuscript of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* in compiling his edition, and noticed many misreadings on the part of Bendall.¹ This is most disturbing, and implies that the Sanskrit quoted here from that text should be taken only as provisional. I hope to be able to examine the Sanskrit manuscript of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* myself in the near future and clarify the matter.

In addition to the Sanskrit quotations in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, we are fortunate to have available one manuscript leaf of the sūtra, found in Central Asia.² It is possible that other leaves lie so far unidentified in the London Hoernle Collection, the location of the present fragment, or in Russian collections. It may be that someone will become able to identify a previously obscure fragment with the help of the present edition and translation. In any case, the one presently known leaf was studied (and apparently identified) by F. W. Thomas,³ transcribed, printed alongside the corresponding Tibetan translation, and given an English translation, the last due to Hoernle himself.⁴ The transcription given below is exact, but in the text printed alongside the Tibetan in the edition of the

¹ See Braarvig 1993: I.163-171.

² Hoernle MS No. 143, SA 17. Published in Hoernle 1916: 116-21, with plate IV.3.

³ I say "apparently" because many identifications of these fragments were actually made by Watanabe Kaigyoku on the basis of Chinese translations, and only later located in their Tibetan translations. Such is not specified for the present fragment, but might be suspected.

⁴ According to Thomas's note in Hoernle 1916: 86. Thanks to the very great kindness of my friend Matsuda Kazunobu 松田和信, I was able to examine photographs of the manuscript newly taken in London, and on the basis of these photographs I venture to print here a transcription of the manuscript as I could read it. I was greatly helped in reading the fragment by the availability of Thomas's transcription, and in fact my reading differs very little from his. I have noted what I was able to read on the photos available to me, but throughout I have generally followed Thomas's reading, based as it is not only on his extensive experience with manuscript decipherment but also, and most importantly, on direct access to the manuscript itself, and to a state of the manuscript which may have been slightly better than its current condition.

Ratnarāśi itself I have omitted the apparatus, printing only what I think the correct text should be. I hope that the complete transcription of the manuscript fragment here will serve as an excuse for this procedure.

()	partially legible akṣaras
[<i>italics</i>]	reconstructed akṣaras
X ₁	virāma
///	destroyed.
↓	represents a similar looking punctuation mark in the manuscript.
•	represents a similar looking punctuation mark in the manuscript.
bold	indicates the first akṣara in a line.

Recto:

///saṁmohaṁ nigacchati • 8 ime kāśyapa aṣṭau śramaṇadharmāvaraṇās te pravrajitena parivarjayitavyāḥ ↓ nāhaṁ (k)āśyapa śra(maṇa)līngasaṁs(th)ā[pa-
nam ida]m iti vadāmi • guṇadharmaṁ pratipatyāhaṁ kāśyapa śramaṇam iti vadāmi • śramaṇena kāśyapa kāye smiṁ kā(ś)āya(n dh)āra[yamā]ṇena ni(ś-
kā)[śāyeṇa te]na bhavitavyaṁ • tat kasmād dhetoḥ niṣkaśāyasya kāśyapa
kāśāyam anujñātaṁ yaḥ kaścit kāśyapa (s)akaśāya[h kā]ye smiṁ [kā](ś)ā[yam
dhāraya]ti anyatrāśayādhimuktyā sarvāṁs tāṁ kāśāyadagdhān iti vadāmi tat
kasmād dhetoḥ āryāṇāṁ eṣa kāśyapa dhvaja(h) upaśaṁm[ānukū]lo [maitrānu-
yukta i]ti virāgacaritānāṁ etāni vastrā(ṇ)i • tatra kāśyapa ya āryāṇāṁ dhvajās
tāṁ śrṇuṣva • dvādaśeme kāśyapa āryāṇāṁ (dhva)jāḥ [katam](e) [dvādaśa]

Verso:

///pa āryāṇāṁ dhvajam 1 samādhir āryāṇāṁ dhvajah 2 prajñā āryāṇāṁ
dhvajah 3 vimuktir āryāṇāṁ dhvajah 4 vimuktijñānadarśanam āryāṇ(ām) dhvajah

5 satyāvatāra (ā)[*ryāṇām dhvajāḥ* 6] pratītyasamutpādānubuddhyanatā āryāṇām
 dhvajāḥ 7 catbāro (b)rahmavihārā āryāṇām dhvajāḥ 9¹ catbāri dhyā(n)āni āryā-
 ṇām dhvajāḥ 9 ca(t)asra ārūpya[*samā*]pattaya āryāṇām dhvajāḥ 10 niyāmā-
 vakkrāntir āryāṇām dhvajāḥ 12² ime kāśyapa dvādaśāryāṇām dhvajāḥ (t)atra
 kāśyapa yo bhi(kṣu)r e(bh)ir dharmair a[*nanu*]gataḥ āryāṇām dhvajāḥ kāśyapa-
 vastraṁ kāye dhārayati tam ahaṁ vitathadharmapratipannam iti vadā(m)i •
 u(ḍḍ)aradharmavihāriṇam i(t)i vadāmi • (ta)[*thāgata*]śāsanadūsthitam iti vadāmi
 nirvāṇapakṣavipakṣasthitam iti vadāmi • sarīskārapakṣānukūlam iti va(d)āmi •
 mārabaddhāgrastam iti vadā[mi]

We may translate this as follows:

8) ... he becomes stupified.

Kāśyapa, these eight are obstructions to the qualities which define a true śramaṇa. The renunciant must abandon them.

Kāśyapa, I do not say that one is a śramaṇa by virtue of his physical appearance and attributes, but I say that one who practices virtuous qualities is a [true] śramaṇa. Kāśyapa, a śramaṇa wearing the ochre monastic robes on his body must do so unstained by impurity. Why? Kāśyapa, I stipulate that the ochre monastic robe is for one without impurities, but, Kāśyapa, I say that all of those who, characterized by impurity, wear the ochre monastic robes on their bodies burn the ochre monastic robes, except for those earnest in their intention. Why? Because this is the banner of the Nobles. These garments, which belong to those who are practice free from passion, conform to their tranquility and are attendant upon their friendliness. In this regard, Kāśyapa, listen to what are the banners of the Nobles. Kāśyapa, these twelve are the banners of the Nobles. Which twelve?

- 1) ... is the banner of the Nobles.
- 2) Mental trance is the banner of the Nobles.
- 3) Wisdom is the banner of the Nobles.

¹ An error for 8.

² An error for 11. Item 12 is missing.

- 4) Liberation is the banner of the Nobles.
- 5) Knowledge and vision of liberation is the banner of the Nobles.
- 6) Entrance into the Truths is the banner of the Nobles.
- 7) Awareness of dependent co-origination is the banner of the Nobles.
- 8) The four immeasurables are the banner of the Nobles.
- 9) The four concentrations are the banner of the Nobles.
- 10) The four formless attainments are the banner of the Nobles.
- 11) The entry into the certainty [to attain nirvāṇa] is the banner of the Nobles.

Kāśyapa, these twelve are the banners of the Nobles.

In that regard, Kāśyapa, I say that whichever monk, without possessing these banners, wears the ochre monastic robes, the banner of the nobles, upon his body, practices the Teaching in an erroneous way. I say that he dwells in contradiction to the teaching. I say that he dwells far from the teachings of the Tathāgata. I say that he dwells in opposition to the side of nirvāṇa. I say he is partial to the side of saṃsāra.¹ I say he is caught by the hook of Māra.

According to the indications given by Thomas, the manuscript measures approximately 290 × 65 mm. He has called the script "Upright Gupta." Although I am no specialist in such matters, the script appears to me to resemble that called "Südturkistanische Brāhmī" by Sander, namely her Schrifttypus VII, alphabet v.²

As I have stated, then, at present we have two sources for fragments of the *Ratnarāśi* in an Indic language, first the manuscript leaf from Central Asia and second the several lengthy quotations in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. Both of these are written in Buddhist Sanskrit, by which I mean, they are written in a language, or perhaps better dialect, which is morphologically and syntactically Sanskrit, with some peculiar Buddhist vocabulary as the main distinguishing feature setting it apart from Brahmanical Sanskrit.

¹ The reading *saṃskāra* for *saṃsāra* is an error.

² Sander 1968: tables 29-40, and the table on page 45. The *na* appears, however, to differ slightly from that illustrated in the tables.

It is a question, however, whether this is the only linguistic guise in which the *Ratnarāṣi* ever existed in Indic. It is possible that the text circulated in versions in more than one dialect, or it is also possible that over time a less Sanskritic version was “polished” or Sanskritized until it attained the shape in which it has reached us. We know that such processes took place in the case of other texts, but in the absence of other evidence, any claims about the linguistic history or past of the *Ratnarāṣi* would be pure speculation.

Fortunately, just such evidence is at hand, in the form of hints we can gain from divergences between the Tibetan (and sometimes Sanskrit) text and the Chinese translation. As we have seen, the Chinese translation predates the Tibetan translation by some four hundred years, and therefore we might hypothesize that it preserves a somewhat earlier form of the text. In fact, as we have noticed, the content of the text seems to have been remarkably stable over time, but the same does not necessarily follow for its linguistic shape.

Several times in the text there appear the words “fearful of censure in the other world,” or more literally “being one who sees [or: does not see] the danger which will result in the other world from even the smallest faults.” We find this technical term at I.14, III.15, IV.1, and VII.25. At I.14 the Sanskrit is preserved in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* as *paralokāvyābhayadarśi(n)*, rendered quite correctly in all four places into Tibetan as *'jig rten pha rol tu kha na ma tho bas 'jigs par lta ba*. However, the Chinese renderings are not consistent. At III.15 the Chinese has only (不)畏後世, “(does not) fear the other world.” This rendering is not inspired, but it is reasonably understandable. When, on the other hand, we look at the remaining renderings we find something very peculiar. I.14 and IV.1 render 畏於後世喻如金剛, “fearful of the other world, for instance, like a *vajra*.” VII.25 has (不)見後世過惡喻如金剛, “(does not) see the evil of sin in the other world, for instance, like a *vajra*.” The latter two renderings provide just the clue we

needed to help us uncover some of the linguistic history of the *Ratnarāṣi*.

The Sanskrit technical term provided in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* in compound form as *paralokāvadyabhayadarśi(n)* is quite often found in both Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit literature, both as a compound and as separate terms in a set phrase. Moreover, the term *paraloka* is often omitted, and as far as I can tell from the *Pāli Tipiṭaka Concordance* never occurs in the cliché in canonical Pāli, in which we find the very common expression *aṇumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī*.¹ As for Sanskrit, we can point for instance to KP §134 in which we find the expression *aṇumātreṣv avadyeṣu bhayadarśi samādāya*, with another manuscript reading *aṇumātreṣv api vadyeṣu bhayadarśi samādāya*. Expressions in Sanskrit with both *vadya* and *avadya* occur,² but in Pāli the form seems to be always *vajja*.

The Chinese translators have presented us with a precious gift with their rendering “for instance, like a *vajra*.” There is no way that we can tease any related sense out

¹ See PTC s.v. *aṇumatta* and *paraloka*. In the first numerous references to the set phrase *aṇumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī* are listed.

² This conclusion disagrees with that drawn by Edgerton, BHSD s.v. *vadya*. Edgerton argued that “since Pali *vajja* is common in other locutions, there seems no doubt that we must read *vadyeṣu*” where Senart’s manuscripts of Mv. read *°mātreṣevadyeṣu* or *°mātreṣv abandheṣu* (Mv. iii.52,1), which Senart emended to *°mātreṣv āvadyeṣu*. Edgerton then adds parenthetically: “intending *avadyeṣu*? This would seem plausible but for the close Pali parallel.” In fact, I think *avadyeṣu* is quite correct. There are several examples which bear this out. The *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden* (Waldschmidt et al. 1973-) s.v. *anu-mātra* and *a-vadya* cites SHT (I) 613R3: *///(aṇu)mātreṣ[v] apy avadyeṣu bhayadarśi samādāya śikṣati śikṣāpadeṣu*, a reading which agrees exactly with one of those in KP §134. The same pattern is found in the *Nachträge* (volume 7), s.v. *anu-mātra* and *a-vadya*, citing SHT (VI) 1474 Bc *///anum[ā]treṣv apy ava[dy]e(su)///*. We may also note here Bbh 7.2: *aṇumātre py avadye bhayadarśi*. I am sure that there are other examples available. These cases show that both forms, *vadya* and the Sanskrit *avadya*, are possible, although *vadya* in this sense is apparently unknown in classical Sanskrit, and the form *avajja* seems not to be found in Pāli in its Sanskrit meaning, according to CPD s.v. *avajja*.

Madhav Deshpande directs my attention to Pāṇini III.1.101 (*avadya-panya-varyā garhya-panita-vyānirodheṣu*), and informs me that here Pāṇini treats *avadya* as an undivided *nipātana* (exceptional form), having the sense of “contemptible, deserving reproach,” rather than as *a + vadya*. In this regard, although he refers to Pāṇini, MW may be wrong to define the word as “not to be praised.” If Pāṇini is to be followed, then the writing of the dictionaries *a-vadya* is not correct; we have to do not with an *a-*privative, but with an undivided form.

of the expression if we think about it only in terms of its meaning. But let us look at it in another way, not from Sanskrit but from Middle Indic. Pāli in this regard shares with many other Middle Indic dialects a common feature, namely that it represents as *-jj-* a number of Old Indian consonant clusters, original *-jj-*, *-jy-*, *-j(j)v-*, *-dy-*, *-ry-*, and *-jr-*. Let us take note here of only two Old Indian words, *vadya* and *vajra*. Both of these, in Pāli and in any number of other Middle Indic dialects, will be rendered as *vajja*.¹ Probably the only possible explanation for the rendering of the expression *paralokāvadyabhaya-darsī(n)* or its equivalents with a Chinese phrase such as 畏於後世喻如金剛, “fearful of the other world, for instance, like a *vajra*,” or 見後世過惡喻如金剛, “seeing the evil of sin in the other world, for instance, like a *vajra*,” is that the translators not only did not recognize or understand the expression, but that they had before them, in memory or more likely in manuscript,² a text which had not *vadya* but rather *vajja*.³ This means that the *Ratnarāśi* available in late fourth — early fifth century China was a text which at least contained the Middle Indicisms of the assimilation of *-dy-* to *-jj-*.

There are other examples as well. At V.4, the Tibetan text has *bsam pa yongs su dag pa*, which points to a Sanskrit original of **āśaya(vi)śuddha*.⁴ The Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi* however has 淨如虛空 which seems, rather, to refer to **ākāśa-viśuddhita*.⁵ It would be possible to explain the apparent disagreement as follows: **āśaya-* > **āyāśa-* > *ākāśa-*, with metathesis and *-k-* hypercorrected for presumed Prakritic *-y-*. Unless one assumes such a confusion of *-k-* and *-y-* it is not possible to explain the “equivalence.” At VI.1 we find the expression that the alms-begging monk

¹ For the details of the phonology, see Pischel 1981 §280 (*dya* = *jja*) and §287 (*jra* = *jja*).

² I say this because I consider it unlikely that someone who memorized a text like this would have so poorly understood it as to make this type of error.

³ It is also likely that vowel length remained unrepresented, and so even if intended the long vowel *-ā-* preceding **vajja* would also have been effaced.

⁴ The equivalence is found for instance in KP §8.

⁵ The term is found for instance in Aṣṭa (Mitra 201 at Wogihara 1932-35: 437.6).

should be “firm in his vows,” *yi dam la brtan par bya 'o*. Chinese however has understood this expression as “firmly adorns himself.” The expression from which the Tibetan was translated almost certainly contained the well-known expression **drdhasamādānaḥ*.¹ I would suggest that the Chinese translators, however, understood rather **drdhasamnaddha*. That is, we might hypothesize the following set of transformations: *samnaddha* < **samadha* < **samada* < *samādāna*. It is unlikely in the extreme, we might note, that the Prakrit with which we must deal here is similar to Gāndhārī, since the latter shows *samnaddha* as *sanadhu*. Finally, at VII.8 we have another case of apparent misunderstanding by the Chinese translators. The monk who wears refuse rag robes is, among other things, “stainless,” and the Sanskrit text evidently had **nirmala*. The Chinese 能離慢心, “free from arrogance,” suggests however that the translators read instead **nirmāna* rather than **nirmala*.

In many of the quotations of various texts found in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the linguistic peculiarities of the quoted materials are faithfully retained. But the *Ratnarāṣi* quotations in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and the text in the single manuscript leaf discovered in Central Asia, reveal no hint of the type of Middle Indic phonology which seems to be hidden behind the Chinese translators’ oversights. We are left, then, with two possibilities. First, several versions of the *Ratnarāṣi* may have circulated simultaneously, and by chance the two versions we know, from the single Central Asian manuscript leaf and from the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* quotations, belong to an almost wholly Sanskritized version. Or, the text may have undergone a process of Sanskritization, from an earlier stage in which it contained Middle Indic features to a later one in which such traces have been removed. The examples I have adduced suggest that Middle Indic features such as the

¹ See for example Mhy. 2409, Aṣṭa (Mitra 523 = Wogihara 1932-35: 984.6; cf. 500 = 949.11), and BHSD s.v. *samādāna* at the end, for further references. The same compound is also found in Pāli, e.g. DN iii.145,24 *dalhasamādāno*.

representation of *-dy-* as *-jj-*, the use of intervocalic *-y-* for *-k-*, non-marking of vowel length, and perhaps confusion of *-l-* and *-n-*, were present in the text.¹ While these are the only features for the existence of which we have any sort of evidence at all, it nevertheless seems that it would be *prima facie* unlikely for a text to have contained only one or two morphological (as opposed to lexical) Middle Indicisms amidst an otherwise “correct” Sanskrit morphology.

It is difficult, and would perhaps be hasty, to draw any conclusions on the basis of the evidence so far presented, concerning for instance whether the *Ratnarāṣi* was once written not in Buddhist Sanskrit but rather in Buddhist Middle Indic. So far the most detailed study of the type of problem we have been addressing here is that of Karashima 1992. It is important, therefore, to note his caveat:² “[I]n most cases, it is difficult to discern whether such a disagreement between [the Chinese translation] and the Sanskrit versions was the result of phonetic changes which took place in its original language, or that it is merely the translators’s misinterpretation....” Despite his detailed study of Dharmarakṣa’s Chinese translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, in the end Karashima hesitates to draw any final conclusion concerning its putative original linguistic form. Especially faced with the mountain of uncertainties brought to light by Karashima’s work, it would be wise to refrain from drawing any conclusions here as well. But if we cannot know much about older forms of the Indic text of the *Ratnarāṣi*, we do know something about that stage of the text which is preserved.

As mentioned above, a not inconsiderable portion of the *Ratnarāṣi* is found, in Sanskrit, quoted in Śāntideva’s great compendium of Mahāyāna scripture, the *Śikṣā-*

¹ On the last see Pischel 1981 §260 (and §247), Geiger 1943: §43, and Karashima 1992: 269 (top). Karashima quotes a confusion between *mala* and *māna*, but points out that the *l/n* confusion might likewise be a phenomenon operating within the Chinese language itself and therefore is not necessarily reflective of any Indic original.

² Karashima 1992: 263.

samuccaya. These quotations are found also in the Tibetan and Chinese quotations of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. There are several points which should be noticed about the quotations and their translations, in addition to the remarks offered above concerning the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. First, it is important to note that the *Ratnarāśi* known to Śāntideva is very close to the state of the text as preserved in the canonical Tibetan translation. There are, of course, as mentioned above, several instances of inversion of the order of a few clauses, and in some places Śāntideva appears to have paraphrased the text or to have known a version of the text which did so. (It is also possible that the true state of affairs is the reverse, and that these sections were expanded later in the version which was translated into Tibetan.) But on the whole the correspondence between the Sanskrit quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the text in the Kanjur version is remarkable. On the other hand, in some cases of disagreement between the Sanskrit found in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the Tibetan translation, the Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi* agrees very closely with the version found in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. This may suggest that the Sanskrit quotations in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* preserve a version of the sūtra older than that translated into Tibetan and found in the Kanjur.

I remarked above that the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* used the canonical Kanjur translation to render those passages quoted by the text. This is not the case with the Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the 大乘集菩薩學論, T. 1636. The whole situation of this text is peculiar in the extreme. It might be argued that by the time this text was rendered into Chinese, in the Song 宋 dynasty, the level of knowledge of Sanskrit in China had reached a low ebb, and thus the translators were incapable of offering a coherent rendering. There is much to be said for this way of thinking, and one is not hard pressed to find examples of translations from that period that are, to be charitable, difficult to understand, or to be a little more critical, incoherent. What is so

difficult to understand is this: There is no question that the Chinese translators, for all their inabilities, did certainly realize that the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is an anthology of quotations of texts, many or most of which were already available to them in Chinese translation. Why did they not — and they apparently did not — take the trouble to, or rather take the opportunity to, look up the older Chinese translations of the passages in question and let these aid them in their understanding? It seems most likely that the motivation for many translations in this period was not the unavailability of a certain text in China, for many texts were retranslated at this time, but the desire of those in charge to carry out such large-scale projects as had been done in former days.¹ This being the case, we can imagine that the translators had access at least to reasonable monastic libraries, if not to other assistance. The *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is not the only case in which one is led to wonder what went wrong. The Song period retranslation of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* is so-filled with misunderstandings as to positively baffle the reader — and yet there were at least three good and intelligible Chinese translations available already to which the translators could have turned for guidance.²

Those credited with the Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, however, were apparently Indian scholars whose basic understanding of the original one would like to hesitate to question. The suspicion, therefore, should perhaps fall on the inability of the Indians and their Chinese assistants to communicate and express the meaning of the texts in Chinese.³ Apparently the first nine *juan* of the text were translated by *Dharma-

¹ The circumstances in which Weijing (see below) and others were forced to study Sanskrit at the imperial command has been mentioned by Michihata 1976: 177. It might also be noted that the well-known custom in the Song of using much shorter *juan* than in previous times is commonly attributed to the desire simply to make texts appear much longer than they otherwise would have.

² I will discuss this translation in more detail in my study of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, now in preparation.

³ I have discussed at some length, in my unpublished paper on the *Guan Wuliangshou jing*, what the process of translation in China actually entailed in terms of the real responsibilities of the man whose name was attached to the work in the canon and in catalogues. It is clear that, rather than doing any actual

pāla 法護, and the text was completed after his death by *Sūryayaśas 日稱 and others, it being “published” in 1057.¹ It is interesting to note that the Chinese translation of the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, which we will consider below, is also attributed in part to *Dharmapāla, this time in collaboration with the Chinese monk Weijing 惟淨 and others. The character of this work and indeed of the other Chinese translations attributed to *Dharmapāla differs so much from the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* translation that there may be legitimate doubt whether *Dharmapāla’s level of involvement in the translation of the other works attributed to him and in that of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* may not have been different. Such an impression is reinforced by the report that he died part way through the translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.

We now come to another problem, namely the question of quotations attributed to the *Ratnarāṣi* in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* which are in fact not found in the extant sūtra. The *Sūtrasamuccaya* is a compendium of sūtra quotations attributed, although it is not clear with how much accuracy, to Nāgārjuna. The text is extant only in its Tibetan and Chinese translations. In this text appear several passages which are, putatively, quotations from the *Ratnarāṣi*. But when we examine these passages, we notice a very odd and strange thing, namely that *none* of these quotations are in fact to be found in the extant text of the *Ratnarāṣi*. In addition, one of the questionable passages is also found, in identical form, in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.² I have so far not been able to

translation, for the most part the foreign monk was there to guarantee the authenticity and orthodoxy of the work. I refer for further comments on this issue to my forthcoming study.

Regarding the present question, Nakano 1935: 2 has remarked on the extreme difficulty he had in reading the translation and rendering the Chinese into Japanese grammar, and he suggests: “I do not know whether it is due to the extremely faulty Sanskrit original used by *Dharmapāla and *Sūryayaśas, or whether their familiarity with the Sanskrit language was insufficient, or whether the responsibility rather lies with the translators 譯語者 or the scribes 筆受者, but in any case it is regrettable that our trust in the Chinese translations is shaken by this work.”

¹ So Nakano 1935: 1. On *Dharmapāla, see Mochizuki 1932-36: 4592 (s.v. Hōgo), *Sūryayaśas 4069 (s.v. Nichishō), and Weijing 4906-07 (s.v. Yuijō).

² The absence of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*’s so-called *Ratnarāṣi* quotation from the extant Chinese

locate any text(s) in which passages similar to those quoted in fact appear. I think that there are two possibilities which might explain this circumstance.

First, it is possible that the authors of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* made an error in attributing, perhaps from memory, the passages in question to the *Ratnarāṣi*. However, while this hypothesis might be defensible in the case of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* alone, in which none of the passages cited as being from the *Ratnarāṣi* in fact belongs to the extant sūtra, it would be harder to make this argument for the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, since that compendium cites many other passages, some quite lengthy, from the actual *Ratnarāṣi*. Of course, it is possible that in the latter case Śāntideva made an error only in one attribution. The fact that the one passage in which he made an error (if this is indeed what it is) is in fact the one passage attributed to the *Ratnarāṣi* in both the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, however, raises questions about the relationship between the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.¹ If the quotations are in fact attributed in error, then the possibility remains of locating the actual source.

A second possibility is that the *Ratnarāṣi* known to the author of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and to Śāntideva contained the quoted passages, but later they either dropped out of the recension translated into Chinese and Tibetan or were part of an entirely different recension, which has not come down to us. I think that at least at this stage it would be

translation of the *Ratnarāṣi* was noted by Wogihara 1904-06: 258. The names under which the passages are quoted make it quite clear that a text named *Ratnarāṣi* is being referred to: The Sanskrit of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has exactly *Ratnarāṣisūtra*, all Tibetan versions *Rin po che 'i phung po 'i mdo*, and the ninth century Chinese translations of both *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and *Sūtrasamuccaya* have 實積經. Only the last could be considered at all problematic, as it is also used to render *Ratnakūṭa*. The *Kāśyapaparivarta* is often cited in Chinese by this name. But by the ninth century in China the *Ratnarāṣi* was of course known as part of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, and there can be little question that *Ratnarāṣi* is in fact intended here.

¹ It is expected that this issue will be dealt with by Bhikkhu Pāsādika in his forthcoming translation of the *Sūtrasamuccaya*. My feeling is that previous studies which have touched on the question have not always contributed positively to its solution. The question of the authorship of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* is of course not unrelated to the question of the relationship between that text and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. The interested reader may refer to Filliozat 1964, Sasaki 1965, and more recently Ichishima 1986.

difficult to decide between these two possibilities. In this context we should recall that Étienne Lamotte some time ago also remarked that the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* quotes one extract from the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* which is not found in any of the extant versions of that sūtra.¹ Lamotte drew no conclusions from this fact, but future studies should take cognizance of these problems.

I present below the text of the problematic passages, in Tibetan, Chinese, and in the case of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* passages, Sanskrit.² Where the Sanskrit is available, I translate it; otherwise I translate the Tibetan, although it differs somewhat from the Chinese in some places.

1) *Sūtrasamuccaya* 22.1-16:

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las kyang / kun dga' bo 'di ji snyam du sems / mi rkang lag bcad na 'tsho 'am / gsol pa bcom ldan 'das 'tsho'o // bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / ji ltar snying phyung na 'tsho 'am / gsol pa bcom ldan 'das de ni mi 'tsho'o // bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / kun dga' bo lag pa dang rkang pa lta bur nga'i shā ri'i bu dang / maud gal gyi bur lta'o // snying lta bu ni byang chub sems dpa' rnam lta'o // kun dga' bo gal te byang chub sems dpa' shing rta'i nang du zhugs te / 'dod pa'i yon tan lngas rtse dga' zhing dga' dgur spyod la / de'i shing rta 'dren pa gzhan med na / kun dga' bo byang chub sems dpa' de'i shing rta ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i dbu la yang bskur ro // gal te gnas brtan shā ri'i bu dang maud gal gyi bu nam par thar pa'i sgo gsum la bskal pa 'am bskal pa las lhag par gnas kyang / de la de bzhin gshegs pa rim gro dang g-yog bya bar brtson par mi mdzad do zhes gsungs so //.

大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (XXXII) 52b22-c3:

寶積經云。佛言。阿難。於汝意云何。譬若有人雙斷手足。能活命不。阿難答言。

¹ Lamotte 1962: 1, note 1, referring to *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 153.20-22.

² For the *Sūtrasamuccaya* I refer to the edition of Pāsādika 1989, and for the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* to that of Bendall 1897-1902.

手足雖其命尚活。佛言。阿難。若或有人剖裂其心。是人能活命不。阿難答言。不也。世尊。佛言。阿難。汝應當知我之弟子大目乾連及舍利子猶如手足。而諸菩薩其猶我心。阿難。若有菩薩御大寶車以五欲功德作神通遊戲而無有人爲其駕御。如來爾時爲彼菩薩力御其車爲進前道。若舍利子及目乾連修三解脫門若經一劫若過一劫。如來不復與其勤力而爲策進。

[The Buddha said:] “Ānanda. What do you think? If the legs and hands of a man are cut off, can he still live?” [Ānanda] replied: “Blessed One. (Despite his hands and legs) he can live.” The Blessed One said: “If for instance one were to tear out his heart, could he live?” [Ānanda] replied: “Blessed One. Then, he would not live.” The Blessed One said: “Ānanda. My [disciples] Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana are like the hands and feet. The bodhisattvas are like the heart. Ānanda. If a bodhisattva climbs aboard a (great jeweled) wagon, sporting with the five objects of desire (**pañca-kāmaguṇa*) and indulging in sensual pleasures, and if his wagon has no other driver, Ānanda, that bodhisattva’s wagon should be given even unto the charge of the Tathāgata. Even if the Elders Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana dwell in the three gates of liberation for kalpas or more, still the Tathāgata will not make efforts to reverence or serve them.

2) *Sūtrasamuccaya* 27.2-11:

yang rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las / dgra bcom pa'i 'bras bu 'dod pa'i mi gang la
la zhig gis / nor bu rin po che dag gis 'jig rten gyi khams mtha' yas pa bkang ste /
sbyin pa byin pa bas / byang chub sems dpa' gang gis byang chub sems dpa' theg
pa pa'i gang zag mthong nas thams cad mkhyen pa nyid dang ldan pa'i sems kyis
rjes su yi rang na rjes su yi rang ba dang ldan pa'i bsod nams 'di la snga ma'i sbyin
pa'i bsod nams kyi phung po des / brgya'i char yang nye bar mi 'gro ba nas rgyu'i
bar du yang mi bzod do zhes gsungs so //

大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (XXXII) 53a18-22:

寶積經云。若或有人爲求阿羅漢果故。以摩尼寶充滿無邊世界而行布施。有菩薩乘

人見已發一切智相應隨喜心而此相應隨喜所有福蘊。比前布施福蘊百分不及一乃至鳥波尼殺雲分亦不及一。

If there were a certain man who aspires for the fruit of Arhatship, and filling the world-realms completely with great treasures he gives them as a gift, and if a bodhisattva, seeing a person belonging to the bodhisattva vehicle, were to delight in the idea of possessing the mind of omniscience, then the mass of merit of the former gift would not approach even a hundredth part of this merit of delighting [in the idea of possessing the mind of omniscience]; there is no comparison (**upaniṣada*) between them.

3) *Sūtrasamuccaya* 96.18-97.1:

yang chos sgrub pa ni / rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las 'byung ba / 'od srungs 'di
lta ste dper na / rgya mtsho chen por 'jug par 'dod pa'i tshong pa ni rin po che'i
gling nas / bdag gi yul du bde bar phyin gyi bar du de gru la shin tu rtog par byed
do // 'od srungs de bzhin du byang chub sems dpa' thams cad mkhyen pa'i rgya
mtsho la 'jug par 'dod pas / ji tsam byis pa so so'i skye bo dang / nyan thos dang
rang sangs rgyas thams cad kyi sa las 'das te / bdag gi pha'i spyod yul du 'jug pa'i
bar du'o // pha rol tu phyin pa drug gi gru shin tu rtog par bya'o // zhes gsungs so
//

大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (XXXII) 61b19-24:

如寶積經云。佛言。迦葉。譬如商主欲入大海求無價寶。先善觀察堅固船筏乃至到寶所已還復自舍。迦葉。菩薩摩訶薩亦復如是。欲入一切智海。先當觀察勤行六波羅蜜多乃至超過一切愚夫異生聲聞緣覺之地。然後住佛果位。

For instance, Kāśyapa, as an example, a merchant desiring to go to sea (to seek priceless jewels) will keep a careful eye on his boat until he has travelled safely from the island of jewels back to his own country. Just so, Kāśyapa, the bodhisattva desiring to go out to the sea of omniscience, from the time that he

passes over the stages [lands] of common people, auditors and lone buddhas until he enters his fatherland [Chinese: the state of Buddhahood] must keep a careful eye on the boat of the six perfections.

4) *Sūtrasamuccaya* 103.17-104.5:

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las kyang / 'od srungs 'di lta ste / dper na rgya mtsho'i nang du gru zhig na / gang dag shing leb bam / gzhan ci yang rung ba zhig la brten pa de dag ni bde bar 'gram du phyin par 'gyur ro // 'od srungs de bzhin du byang chub sems dpa'i theg pa pa thams cad mkhyen pa'i sems kyi gru zhig ste / byang chub las rab tu nyams kyang / gang dge ba'i bshes gnyen gyi shing leb la brten pa de dag ni / yang thams cad mkhyen pa'i sems rab tu thob ste / chos thams cad kyi pha rol tu song nas chos kyi dbyings kyi gling du phyin to // de bas na 'od srungs bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub ni dge ba'i bshes gnyen la brten to // zhes gsungs so //

大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (XXXII) 62b6-16:

如寶積經云。佛言。迦葉。如人乘船入其大海。而於中流船忽破壞。是中或有依一版木。或餘橡木隨得所依安隱到岸。迦葉。菩薩乘於一切智心之船亦復如是。忽於中流壞失菩薩乘法。若遇善知識而以依止彼即還得一切智心。乘諸波羅蜜多法運載而行到法界洲。迦葉。所有阿耨多羅三藐三菩提法。而悉依止善知識故。

For instance, Kāśyapa, as an example, if a ship were to founder in the midst of an ocean, with the help of a plank or of anything else whatsoever some people might easily reach the shore. In just this way, Kāśyapa, the ship of the mind of omniscience, [which carries] the followers of the bodhisattva vehicle, might founder, and although [those followers of the bodhisattva vehicle] might lose their awakening, still some, with the help of a plank which is the good friend (**kalyāṇamitra*), might yet obtain the mind of omniscience. Going to the distant shore beyond all things, they arrive at the island of the essence of reality (**dharmadhātu*). Therefore, Kāśyapa, [the acquisition of] unexcelled perfect awakening depends on the help of the good friend.

5) *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 312.3-6:

uktam *cāryaRatnarāśisūtre* / ye tribhavaparyāyapannāḥ satvās te sarve pratyekaṁ
tathāgatastūpān kārayeyur evaṁrūpān uccaistvena tadyathā sumeruḥ parvatarājaḥ /
tās ca gaṅgānadīvālikāsamān kalpān pratyekaṁ sarvasatkāraiḥ satkuryuḥ / yaś ca
bodhisatvo 'virahitasarvajñatācittenaikapuṣpam apy āropayet ayaṁ tasmāt pūrvakāt
puṇyaskandhād bahutaraṁ puṇyaṁ prasavet //

Śikṣāsamuccaya:¹

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las kyang / gang dag srid pa gsum du gtogs pa'i sems
can de dag thams cad so so nas de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten 'phang du 'di lta
ste / ri'i rgyal po ri rab lta bu byed la de dag [P ø] la yang so so nas gang gā'i [P
ga'i] klung gi [P inserts bye ma] snyed kyī [P kyis] bskal par bsti stang bya ba
thams cad kyis [P kyī] bsti stang byed pa bas byang chub sems dpa' gang thams cad
mkhyen pa nyid kyis [P kyī] sems dang ma bral bas me tog gcig 'dor na / de ni
bsod nams kyī phung po snga ma bas bsod nams ches mang du bskyed do zhes
gsungs so //

Sūtrasamuccaya 109.8-17:

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las / sems can gang dag srid pa gsum du gtogs pa de
dag thams cad kyis / so so nas de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten 'phang du ri'i rgyal
po ri rab tsam bya ste / de dag la bskal pa gang gā'i klung gi bye ma snyed du so so
nas bsti stang du bya ba thams cad kyis bsti stang byas pa bas / byang chub sems
dpa' thams cad mkhyen pa nyid kyī sems dang ma bral ba gang gis me tog gcig
phul na / de ni bsod nams kyī phung po snga ma bas ches mang du bskyed do zhes
ji skad gsungs pa lta bu'o //

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 134a23-27:

又如寶積經云。假使衆生充滿三有各各造作如來塔廟。其量高廣如須彌盧山。於殞埵

¹ Derge Tōhoku 3940 *dbu ma, khi* 167b7-168a2 and Peking Ōtani 5336 *dbu ma, ki*, 195a8-b3.

伽沙劫各以種種上妙供養。若菩薩以不捨一切智心持以一花奉施彼塔所獲福蘊復過於彼。

大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (XXXII) 63a25-b1:

如寶積經云。假使滿三界中一切有情。是諸有情各各造立如來塔廟。如是色相一一高顯猶如須彌山王。而諸有情經於殑伽沙數劫中。各各尊重供養是塔。若有不離一切智心菩薩。但置一華而爲供養。此獲福蘊勝前福蘊。其數倍多。

Suppose beings filling the three states of existence were all, each one of them, to build stūpas for the Tathāgata, in form and height just like Sumeru, the king of mountains, and they were to worship all of them individually for as many aeons as there are grains of sand on the banks of the Ganges river. And [on the other hand] if some bodhisattva, with a mind which has not lost [the aspiration for] omniscience, were to offer even one flower, the latter [act] would bring forth merit far exceeding the mass of merit of the former [act].

6) *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 312.7-21:

atraivoktaṃ / ye khalu punas trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātāu satvās te sarve mahāyānasamprasthitā bhavyeṣu sarve ca cakravartirājyasamanvāgatā bhavyeṣu ekaikaś ca rājā cakravartī mahāsamudrapramāṇadīpasthālīm kṛtvā sumerumātrām vartim ādīpya pratyekam evamrūpām dīpapūjām tathāgatacaityeṣu pravartayet / yaś cābhiniṣkrāntagrāhāvāso bodhisatvas tailapraṁkṣiptām vartim kṛtvā 'dīpya tathāgatacaitye dhārayet / asyās tailapraṁkṣiptāyā varter etat pūrvakam pradīpadānam śatata-mīm api kalām nopaiti / yāvad upaniṣadam api na kṣamata iti / peyālām //
yaś ca khalu punas te rājānaś cakravartino buddhapramukhaṃ bhikṣusamgham sarvasukhopadhānaṃ satkuryuḥ yaś cābhiniṣkrāntagrāhāvāso bodhisatvaḥ piṇḍapātraṃ caritvā pātraparyāpannam pareṣāṃ samvibhajya paribhūjīta idaṃ tato bahutaram ca mahārghataram ca / yac ca te rājānaś cakravartinaḥ sumerumātram cīvararāśim buddhapramukhāya bhikṣusamghāya dadyuḥ yac cābhiniṣkrāntagrāhāvāso bodhisatvas tricīvarabāhirdhā mahāyānasamprasthitāya buddhapramukhyāya bhikṣusamghāya vā tathāgatacaitye vā dadyād / idaṃ bhikṣoś cīvaradānam etat

pūrvakacīvararāśim abhibhavati / yac ca te rājāṇaḥ pratyekaṁ sarvaṁ jambūdvī-
 paṁ puṣpasamstṛtaṁ kṛtvā tathāgatacaitye niryātaḥ yac cābhiniṣkrāntagrāvāso
 bodhisatvaḥ antaśa ekapuṣpaṁ api tathāgatacaitye āropayet / asya dānasyaitat
 pūrvakaṁ dānaṁ śatatamīm api kalām nopaiti / yāvad upaniṣadam api nopaiti //

*Śikṣāsamuccaya:*¹

yang *de nyid* las / gang [P ø] stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi kham na
 sems can gang dag yod pa de dag thams cad theg pa chen po la yang dag par zhugs
 par gyur la / thams cad 'khor los [P lo] sgyur ba'i rgyal srid dang ldan par gyur te /
 'khor los [P lo] sgyur ba'i rgyal po re res kyang mar me'i snod rgya mtsho chen po
 tsam byas te / ri rab tsam gyi mar me'i snying pos mar me bus la / [P ø /] so so nas
 'di [P *de*] lta bu'i mar me'i mchod pas [P inserts *de bzhin gshegs pa'i*] mchod rten
 rnams la mchod pa bas / byang chub sems dpa' khyim gyi gnas nas 'byung ba gang
 gis [P *gi*] mar me'i snying po 'brus [P 'bru] mar gyis bskus te de bzhin gshegs pa'i
 mchod rten gyi drung du 'dzin na / ras 'bru mar gyis bskus pa'i mar me 'di la snga
 ma'i mar me phul ba des brgya'i char yang mi phod pa nas rgyu'i bar du yang mi
 bzod do //

'khor los [P lo] sgyur ba'i rgyal po de dag gis sangs rgyas la sogs pa'i [P *pa*] dge
 slong gi dge 'dun la bde bar sbyar ba thams cad kyis [P ø] phu dud byed pa bas /
 byang chub sems dpa' khyim gyi gnas nas mngon bar byung ba gang gis bsod
 snyoms blangs te / lhung bzed du chud pa de gzhan dag dang bgo bsha' byas te zan
 de ni de bas ches mang zhing ches rin che'o // gang yang rgyal po chen po de dag
 gis ri rab tsam gyi gos kyi phung po sangs rgyas la sogs pa dge slong gi dge 'dun la
 phul ba bas / byang chub sems dpa' khyim gyi gnas nas mngon par [P ø *mngon*
par] byung ba gang gis phyi rol du [P *tu*] byung ste / sangs rgyas la sogs pa theg pa
 chen po la yang dag par zhugs pa'i dge slong gi dge 'dun dang / de bzhin gshegs
 pa'i mchod rten la chos gos gsum phul na / dge slong gi chos gos byin pa 'dis gos
 sbyin [P *byin*] pa snga ma de zil gyis non par 'gyur ro // yang rgyal po de dag re res
 'dzam bu'i [P *dzambu'i*] gling thams cad me tog gis mdzes par byas te / de bzhin
 gshegs pa'i mchod rten la phul ba bas / byang chub sems dpa' khyim gyi gnas nas
 byung ba gang gi tha na de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten la me tog gcig phul na
 sbyin pa 'di la sbyin pa snga ma bas [P ø] des brgya'i char yang mi phod pa nas

¹

Derge Tōhoku 3939 *dbu ma, khi* 168a2-b2 and Peking Ōtani 5336 *dbu ma, ki*, 195b3-196a3.

rgyu'i bar du yang mi phod do // [P ø //] zhes gsungs so //

Sūtrasamuccaya 109.18-110.6:

yang rin po che 'i phung po 'i mdo nyid las / gang stong gsum gyi stong chen po 'i
'jig rten gyi khams kyis sems can de dag thams cad theg pa chen po la yang dag par
zhugs te / thams cad 'khor los sgyur ba 'i rgyal srid dang ldan par gyur la / 'khor
los sgyur ba 'i rgyal po re res kyang / rgya mtsho chen po tsam gyi mar me 'i snod
byas te / ri rab tsam gyi snying po bsregs la so so nas 'di 'dra ba 'i mar mes de
bzhin gshegs pa 'i mchod rten la mchod pa byas pa bas / gang khyim gyi gnas nas
mngon par byung ba 'i byang chub sems dpas mar me 'i snying po yungs mar gyis
bskus te / de bzhin gshegs pa 'i mchod rten gyi drung du bzung na / mar me phul
ba snga mas snying po yungs mar gyis bskus pa de 'i brgya 'i char yang mi chog pa
nas / rgyu 'i bar du yang mi chog go //

gang yang 'khor los sgyur ba 'i rgyal po de dag gis / sangs rgyas la sogs pa dge
slong gi dge 'dun la / bde ba 'i yo byad thams cad kyis bsti stang du byas pa bas /
gang yang khyim gyi gnas mngon par byung ba 'i byang chub sems dpas bsod
snyoms blangs te / lhung bzed du 'ongs pa / gzhan dang bgos te zos na / de ni de
bas ches ches 'phags so // gang yang 'khor los sgyur ba 'i rgyal po de dag gis / ri
rab tsam gyi chos gos kyis phung po sangs rgyas la sogs pa / dge slong gi dge 'dun
la phul ba bas / gang yang khyim gyi gnas nas mngon par byung ba 'i byang chub
sems dpa' chos gos gsum po ma gtogs par gzhan theg pa chen po la yang dag par
zhugs pa dang / sangs rgyas la sogs pa dge slong gi dge 'dun dang / de bzhin
gshegs pa 'i mchod rten la phul na snga ma 'i chos gos kyis phung po de / dge slong
la chos gos byin pa 'dis zil du brlag go // gang yang 'khor los sgyur ba 'i rgyal po
de dag re res 'dzam bu 'i gling thams cad me tog gis bkang ste / de bzhin gshegs
pa 'i mchod rten la phul ba bas / gang yang khyim gyi gnas nas mngon par byung
ba 'i byang chub sems dpas de bzhin gshegs pa 'i mchod rten la tha na me tog gcig
phul na / sbyin pa sna mas sbyin pa 'di 'i brgya 'i char yang mi chog pa nas rgyu 'i
bar du yang mi chog go // zhes gsungs so //

大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXII) 134a27-b14:

是經復說。假使三千大千世界所有衆生一一皆得轉輪聖王安住大乘一一輪王以大海

量而爲燈器等彌盧山而以燈炷各以如是供養佛塔。若出家菩薩能以少油塗燃以燭持用供養如來塔廟。所得功德勝前燈施。百分歌羅分乃至鳥波尼剎雲分不及其一。又彼轉輪聖王能於現前佛比丘衆以諸樂具而用布施。若出家菩薩常行乞食或有所得隨彼見者分以食之。所獲功德勝前無比。又彼天輪聖王以袈裟服積如須彌。能於現前佛比丘衆。持用布施。若出家菩薩於三衣外所有長物。隨應奉施現前諸佛安住大乘諸比丘僧及如來塔。其所得福倍前所施。又彼轉輪聖王一一各滿閻浮提諸上妙花供養佛塔。若出家菩薩能以一花施如來塔。勝前供養。百分歌羅分乃至鳥波尼剎雲分不及其一。

大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (XXXII) 63b1-19:

又云。假使三千大千世界一切有情悉住大乘而復成轉輪聖王。以香油如大海水。積燃燈草等須彌量。各各燃是廣大燈明供養如來所有塔廟。若有出家菩薩取燃燈草投少分油。於佛塔前燃燈供養。此獲福蘊倍勝前燈明布施。百分不及一。乃至鳥波尼剎雲分亦不及一。又若彼諸轉輪聖王各於佛及苾芻衆所。普施一切受用樂具。若有出家菩薩以自持鉢所乞之食。先減施人然後自食。此獲福蘊勝前福蘊最上廣大。又若彼諸轉輪聖王積以妙衣如須彌量。普施佛及苾芻衆。若有出家菩薩但以三衣。或施十信心菩薩。或施佛及諸苾芻衆。或施如來塔廟之中。此獲福蘊比前所施。極爲殊勝。又若彼諸轉輪聖王一一皆以滿閻浮提布設妙華廣爲供養如來塔廟。若有出家菩薩下至但一華供養如來塔廟者。此獲福蘊比前所施。百分不及一乃至鳥波尼剎雲分亦不及一。

And again, there might be beings in the three thousand times many thousands of world realms, all of whom might set out in the Mahāyāna, and all might come to be equipped with the royal majesty of a universal emperor, and each universal emperor setting up oil lamp basins as vast as the great ocean and lighting wicks as large as Mount Sumeru might perform such worship with those lamps at each and every one of the shrines to the Tathāgata. And a bodhisattva who has gone forth from the household life might set up and light oil spattered

wicks, and might dedicate them to a shrine of the Tathāgata. The former gift of lamps does not approach even a hundredth part of the [merit] from this [gift of] oil splattered wicks; it does not bear any comparison at all. ...

And again, those universal emperors might pay homage with all things which conduce to happiness to the community of monks headed by the Buddha, or a bodhisattva who has gone forth from the household life might eat [only] having begged for alms and shared with others what has fallen into his bowl — this is much more, has much greater value than that. And again, those universal emperors might present to the community of monks headed by the Buddha a pile of robes as great as Mount Sumeru, or a bodhisattva who has gone forth from the household life might present [robes] outside of the triple robe [he habitually wears] to the community of monks just set out in the Mahāyāna headed by the Buddha, or to a shrine of the Tathāgata; this gift of robes by the monk surpasses that former [gift of a] pile of robes. And again, those kings, covering over the whole continent of Jambudvīpa with flowers might present it to a shrine of the Tathāgata, or a bodhisattva who has gone forth from the household life might offer [only] so much as a single flower to a shrine of the Tathāgata, but the former gift does not approach even a hundredth part of the [merit] of this [latter] gift; it does not bear any comparison at all.

We can notice a few things about these passages, in relation to a possible connection with the *Ratnarāśi*. None of the passages presents itself as looking like a lost or missing part of the *Ratnarāśi* in terms of its tone or character. We would be hard pressed to locate a suitable place to insert such passages in the extant sūtra. The overwhelmingly “Mahāyānist” tone of all these passages also sets them apart from the general atmosphere of the *Ratnarāśi*. The constant negative comparisons of the auditors or arhats with the bodhisattvas is not to be found at all in the extant *Ratnarāśi*. Likewise the similes, so common in the *Kāśyapaparivarta* for example, are not in character with the literary style of the *Ratnarāśi*. Finally, although the importance of stūpas in the world of the *Ratnarāśi* is very clear and obvious, especially in Chapter IV, we must notice that the type of reverence for stūpas evident in the sūtra is entirely different from that in these passages.

All of these things combine to lead me to suspect that none of these passages in fact ever actually belonged to the text we now know as the *Ratnarāṣi*. I did make some attempt, using the indices to the Chinese canon, to locate these passages in other sūtras, but without success. It might be fruitful, however, to continue the search elsewhere, in other texts, for the elusive passages.¹

Finally, as mentioned above, we have a few texts which appear to refer to a **Ratnarāṣisūtra*, but without any connection with the extant *Ratnarāṣi*. The twelfth century glossary of terminology called the *Fanyi mingyi ji* 翻譯名義集 by Fayun 法雲 (1088-1158) states, in its entry on Vairocana, that the (or a) 寶梁經 translates the term as 淨滿.² No such term is found in the *Ratnarāṣi*, however, in which moreover no form of the name or term Vairocana appears at all. I do not know to what text the title 寶梁經 actually refers here.

Two works of Daoshi 道世, the *Zhujing yaoji* 諸經要集 T. 2123 and the *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 T. 2122, not only refer to the extant *Ratnarāṣi* with the strange (or wrong) title 寶印經, as we saw above, but also appear to contain spurious quotations.³

¹ It is, of course, true that finding the “source” of a passage or idea does not necessarily put one any closer to actually understanding the passage itself, especially if one is interested in how it is being used and given meaning in its new environment (although comparison is usually illuminating). In the present case, however, we are explicitly dealing with anthologies, and it is therefore reasonable to suggest that Śāntideva and the author(s) of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* either actually quoted (or paraphrased) the passages from somewhere, or made them up. In either case, to further explore the history of Buddhist literature in India, to understand the history of the anthologies themselves, and to try to understand the ways the passages might have changed meaning as they changed context, locating the source(s) will help us significantly.

² T. 2131 (LIV) 1059a13-14: 寶梁經翻爲淨滿。以諸惡都盡故云淨。衆德悉圓故云滿。

³ The first reads: “The *Baoliang jing* says: There was a wise man whose face bore the marks [signifying him as fit to be] king. A physiognomist saw him and married his daughter to him. At a later time the wise man went into a temple and approaching the Vihāra with a staff (?) became arrogant. Therefore he lost those facial marks [signifying him as fit to be] king, and fell into a great hell.” T. 2122 (LIII) 583a20-22 = T. 2123 (LIV) 24b1-3: 又寶梁[T. 2123 + 契]經云。有一賢者面上有國王文理[T. 2123 理 0]。相師見已嫁女與之。後時賢者入僧寺中杖侍伽藍生憍慢。故失國王文理[T. 2123 理 0]墮大地獄。I am not clear what the meaning of this passage is.

The second passage reads: “The *Baoliang jing* says: “[When] sleeping with monks in the same bed, [if] half of [one’s] body becomes numb, [one] will fall into hell and experience great suffering. Do not go to bed first before the monks do,. Do not make merry, tell jokes, or speak indecent language. One who

It is difficult to understand how an author who was obviously quite familiar with the text of the *Ratnarāśi* could have made such erroneous attributions.

The *Ratnarāśi* has been rendered into modern languages twice. Once it was given a more or less mechanical Japanese reading (*kakikudashi*) from Chinese, by Nagai Makoto in the *Kokuyaku Issaikyō*,¹ and more recently it was translated into English, again from Chinese, by a team of translators working in Taiwan.² The Tibetan translation has, as far as I know, heretofore escaped scrutiny. My translation is based in the first place on the Tibetan text, even when, as I have suggested above and in the notes to the translation, it appears in several cases to be defective in comparison with the text preserved in the Sanskrit quotations and Chinese translation. I have made an effort to render all terms into English as far as possible, but I have not translated, as it were, directly from Tibetan. I have in most cases tried to imagine what Indic terminology is presumed by a certain Tibetan expression, and then have sought to express that “imagined original” in English. It may be that some justification is required for this approach. I have approached the *Ratnarāśi* as an Indian text, not a Tibetan or Chinese work. To be

does so will lose dignity and disturb everyone. If one has to answer a call of nature, or get rid of a glob of spit, he should look for the proper places required by the rules (??). If it is not possible to go outside one does not commit a violation. While sleeping [one should] lie on one's right side with one's legs one atop the other. One should focus one's mind on the dawn, keeping in mind that one must rise early; this manifests one's purpose in leaving the home life.” T. 2122 (LIII) 593b26-c2 = T. 2123 (LIV) 23c10-15: 寶梁經云。共僧同床半身枯死。墮地獄受其大苦。僧未眠時不得在先眠。不得調戲言笑說非法語。失於威儀驚動衆心。若便利洩睡。爲求法宿。不得出外者無犯。睡 [T. 2123 眠] 時右脇著床爲 [T. 2123 以] 脚相疊。心係明相。念當早起。表出家因也。 I owe most of the translation of this passage to my friend Yuet Keung Lo.

I do not know if the immediately following passage is also being attributed to the same text : “Therefore a sūtra says: One who sleeps on his back sleeps like an asura. One who sleeps on his stomach sleeps like a preta. One who sleeps on his left side sleeps like a man of desire [householder]. One who sleeps on his right side sleeps like a renunciant. Waking up early while the rest of the community of monks is still asleep dignify your looks and come to the monk's hall.” 是故經云。仰臥者是修羅臥。伏地臥者是餓鬼臥。左脇臥者是貪欲人臥。右脇臥者是出家人臥。衆僧未起在前早起。嚴儀容服至僧房前 (T. 2122 [LIII] 593c2-5 = T. 2123 [LIV] 23c15-18).

¹ Hōshakubu vi.219-54 (2071-2106), Nagai 1932.

² In Chang et al. 1983: 280-312.

sure, the translations of the sūtra have, in some sense, a life of their own, no less interesting perhaps than the Indian life of the text. And there can be little question that the ways in which the text was read by Tibetan or Chinese readers was in some cases different from the ways in which Indian readers (or hearers) understood the work. I cannot pretend that my own understanding and subsequent presentation in English will always reflect what some hypothetical Indian audience would have understood, but it has been my goal to approach and present such an understanding, rather than an understanding another reader might have had. This is what I mean when I say that I have tried to “read through” the Tibetan and Chinese translations. In the case of technical terms I have, therefore, tried to provide in the notes my suggestions concerning what Indic terms lie behind the Tibetan (and occasionally Chinese) translations.

As mentioned above, the translation is based on the Tibetan text edited here. When I have deviated from that text this is invariably noted. Moreover, I have tried to notice the major differences between the Tibetan and Chinese versions, and Sanskrit fragments when available, in the notes. I have rendered the Tibetan version not because it is older or more authentic (it is not older than the Chinese version, and the whole question of what is “more authentic” does not bear up under scrutiny), but rather because it is possible in many cases to imagine the underlying Indic technical terms on the basis of their generally systematic translations into Tibetan. This is not true for Chinese translations in general, and especially in the present case.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abe Jion 阿部慈恩. 1985. "Funzōe-kō" 糞掃衣考 [On *pamsukūla*]. *Tōhō* 東方 1: 162-73.
- Abegg, Emil. 1928. *Der Messiasglaube in Indien und Iran* (Berling and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co.).
- Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善. 1929. *A Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas / Kanpa shibu shiagon goshōroku* 漢巴四部四阿含互照錄 (Nagoya: Hajinkaku-Shobō 破塵閣書房).
- . 1931. *Indo Bukkyō Kōyu Meishi Jiten* 印度佛教固有名詞辭典 (Reprint: Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1967).
- . 1939. *Bukkyō Kyōten Shiron* 佛教經典史論 (Nagoya: Sanbō shoin 三寶書院; Reprint: Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1981).
- Amano Hirofusa 天野宏英. 1956. "Hōchōkyō ni tsuite" 寶頂經について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 4 / 2: 157-58.
- Andersen, Dines and Helmer Smith. 1913. *Sutta-Nipāta* (Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1965).
- Apte, Vaman Shivaram. 1957. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Poona. Reprint: Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company, 1978).
- Bacot, Jacques. 1930. *Dictionnaire Tibétain-Sanskrit par Tse-ring-ouang-gyal*. Buddhica, Deuxième série, Documents, Tome 2 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner).
- Bagchi, Prabodh Chandra. 1927. *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine: Les Traducteurs et les Traductions*. Tome Ier. Sino-Indica, Publications de l'Université de Calcutta 1 (Paris: Paul Geuthner).
- Banerjee, Anukul Chandra. 1957. *Sarvāstivāda Literature* (Calcutta: K. L. Mukhopadhyay).
- . 1977. *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit* (Calcutta: The World Press Private Limited).
- Bapat, P. V. 1933-34. "Unidentified Sources of the Vimuttimaggā (Some Indian Medical Works)." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona* 15 / 3-4: 207-11.

- . 1964. *Vimuktimārga Dhutagaṇa-nirdeśa*, Delhi University Buddhist Studies 1 (Bombay etc.: Asia Publishing House).
- , and Akira Hirakawa. 1970. *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha: A Chinese Version by Saṅghabhadra of Samantapāsādikā*. Bhandarkar Oriental Series 10 (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute).
- , and V. V. Gokhale. 1982. *Vinaya-sūtra*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 22 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Bureau, André. 1955. *Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*. Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient 38 (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient).
- Barth, Auguste. 1898. "Le Pèlerin Chinois I-Tsing." *Journal des Savants*, mai 1898: 261-80, juillet: 425-38, and septembre: 522-41. Reprinted in: *Quarante ans d'Indianisme: Oeuvres de Auguste Barth 4: Comptes Rendus et Notices (1887-1898)* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1918): 408-62. I refer to the reprint edition.
- Baruch, Willy. 1947. "Maitreya d'après les sources Sériinde." *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 132: 67-92.
- Basham, Arthur Lewellyn. 1951. *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas: A Vanished Indian Religion* (London: Luzac & Co.).
- Beal, Samuel. 1871. *A Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese* (London: Trübner & Co.).
- . 1875. *The Romantic Legend of Śākyā Buddha* (London. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal banarsidass, 1985).
- . 1906. *Si-yu-ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Reprint: New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp., 1968). Two volumes in one.
- Bechert, Heinz. 1955-57. "Zur Geschichte der buddhistischen Sekten in Indien und Ceylon." *La Nouvelle Clio* tome 7-9 / nos. 7-10: 311-60.
- . 1964. "Zur Frühgeschichte des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 113: 530-35.
- . 1973. "Notes on the Formation of Buddhist Sects and the Origins of Mahāyāna." *German Scholars on India I* (Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office): 6-18.
- . 1976. "Buddha-Feld und Verdienstübertragung: Mahāyāna-Ideen im Theravāda-Buddhismus Ceylons." *Académie Royale de Belgique: Bulletins de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques* 5e série, tome 62: 27-51.

- . 1977. "Mahāyāna Literature in Sri Lanka: The Early Phase." In Lewis Lancaster, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems: Studies in honor of Edward Conze*. Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 1 (Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series): 361-68.
- . 1982a. "On the Identification of Buddhist Schools in Early Sri Lanka." In Günther-Dietz Sontheimer and Parameswara Kota Aithal, eds., *Indology and Law: Studies in Honour of Professor J. Duncan M. Derrett*. Beiträge zur Südasiensforschung, Südasiens-Institut, Universität Heidelberg 77 (Wiesbaden: Frank Steiner Verlag): 60-76.
- . 1982b. "The Importance of Aśoka's so-called Schism Edict." In L. A. Hercus et al. eds., *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies): 61-68.
- . 1991. "Remarks on the Legal Structure of the Early Buddhist Sangha." In Li Zheng 李铮 et al., eds., *Ji Xianlin Jiaoshou Bashi Huadan Jinian Lunwenji 季羨林教授八十華誕紀念論文集 / Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*, 2 volumes (Jiangxi: Jiangxi renmin chubanshe 江西人民出版社): II.511-24.
- . 1992. "Buddha-field and Transfer of Merit in a Theravāda Source." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35: 95-108.
- Beckh, Hermann. 1914. *Verzeichnis der Tibetischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin: Erste Abteilung: Kanjur (bkah-ḥgyur)*, Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, Vierundzwanzigster band (Berlin: Behrend & Co.).
- Beijing Tushuguan Jinshizu 北京圖書館金石組 and Zhounghua Fojiao Tushu Wenwuguan Shijing-zu 中國佛教圖書文物館石經組. 1987. *Fangshan Shijing Tiji huibian 房山石經題記匯編* (Peking: Shumu wenxian chubanshe 書目文獻出版). [On the cover and title page *hui* is written 彙 rather than 匯.]
- Bendall, Cecil. 1897-1902. *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching Compiled by Çāntideva, Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 1 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- , and W.H.D. Rouse. 1922. *Śikṣā-samuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine* (London; Reprint: New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971).
- Bernhard, Franz. 1965. *Udānavarga*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden X. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse 54 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Bethlenfalvy, Géza. 1980. *A Catalogue of the Uṛga Kanjur*, Śāta- Piṭaka Series 246 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture).

- . 1982. *A Hand-list of the Ulan Bator Manuscript of the Kanjur Rgyal-rtse Them spans-ma*. Debter / Deb-ther / Debtelin: Materials for Central Asiatic and Altaic Studies. Fontes Tibetani I (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó).
- Bhagat, Mansukh Ghelabhai. 1976. *Ancient Indian Asceticism* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal).
- Bischoff, F. A. 1968. *Der Kanjur und seine Kolophone*, Band II (Bloomington, Indiana: The Selbstverlag Press).
- Black, Henry Campbell. 1968. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 4th edition (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing).
- Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth. 1855-75. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* (St. Petersburg: Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften). 7 volumes.
- Braarvig, Jens. 1985. "Dhāraṇī and Pratibhāna: Memory and Eloquence of the Bodhisattvas." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 8 / 1: 17-29.
- . 1993. *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*. Volume I: *Edition of extant manuscripts with an index*. Volume II: *The Tradition of Imperishability in Buddhist Thought* (Oslo: Solum Forlag).
- Brough, John. 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London Oriental Series 7 (London: Oxford University Press).
- Bühler, Georg. 1879. *The Sacred Law of the Āryas: As Taught in the Schools of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vāsistha, and Baudhāyana. Part 1: Āpastamba and Gautama*. The Sacred Books of the East 2 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Reprinted: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965).
- . 1882. *The Sacred Law of the Āryas: As Taught in the Schools of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vāsistha, and Baudhāyana. Part 2: Vāsistha and Baudhāyana*. The Sacred Books of the East 14 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Reprinted: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965).
- . 1886. *The Laws of Manu*. The Sacred Books of the East 25 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Reprinted: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970).
- Burnouf, Eugène. 1844. *Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien* (Paris: Imprimerie Royale).
- . 1876. *Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien*. Second edition. Bibliothèque Oriental 3 (Paris: Maisonneuve).
- . 1852. *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale; Reprint: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1989).

- Burrow, Thomas. 1937. *The Languages of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Cai Niansheng 蔡念生. 1976. *Songzang Yizhen Xumu* 宋藏遺珍敍目 / *Jinzang Nulu Xiaoshi* 金藏目錄校釋 (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chuban 新文豐出版).
- Cai Yunchen 蔡運辰. 1983. *Ershiwuzhong Zangjing Mulu Duizhao Kaoshi* 二十五種藏經目錄對照考釋 (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chuban 新文豐出版).
- Caillat, Colette. 1960. "Deux Études de Moyen-Indien." *Journal Asiatique* 248: 41-64.
- . 1961. "Nouvelles Remarques sur les Adjectifs Moyen-Indiens." *Journal Asiatique* 249: 497-502.
- . 1965. *Les expiations dans le rituel ancien des religieux Jaina* (Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard).
- . 1985. "Le maître et les bouvillons (Uttarajjhāyā 27)." *Bulletin des Etudes Indiennes* 3: 11-24.
- Canevascini, Giotto. 1993. *The Khotanese Saṅghāṣūtra*. Beiträge zur Iranistik 14 (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag).
- Carrithers, Michael. 1983. *The Forest Monks of Sri Lanka: An Anthropological and Historical Study* (Delhi: Oxford University Press).
- Chakraborti, Haripada. 1973. *Asceticism in Ancient India: In Brahmanical, Buddhist, Jaina and Ajivika Societies [from the earliest times to the period of Śaṅkarāchārya]* (Calcutta: Punthi Pustak).
- Chandra, Moti. 1973. *Costumes, Textiles, Cosmetics & Coiffure in Ancient and Medieval India* (Delhi: Oriental Publishers).
- Chang, Garma C.C. (general ed.). 1983. *A Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras: Selections from the Mahāratnakūṭa Sūtra* (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press).
- Chang, Kun. 1957. *A Comparative Study of the Kaṭhinavastu*. Indo-Iranian Monographs I (The Hague: Mouton).
- Chavannes, Emmanuel Édouard. 1894. *Mémoire Composé à l'Époque de la Grande Dynastie T'ang sur les Religieux Éminents qui allèrent chercher la Loi dans les Pays d'Occident par I-Ysing* (Paris: Ernest Leroux).
- . 1911. *Cinq Cents Contes et Apologues extraits du Tripiṭaka chinois et traduits en Français*. Tome III (Paris: Ernest Leroux).

- Ch'en, Kenneth K. S. 1947. "A Study of the Svāgata Story in the *Divyāvadāna* in its Sanskrit, Pāli, Tibetan, and Chinese Versions." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 9 / 3-4: 207-314.
- . 1951. "Notes on the Sung and Yüan Tripiṭaka." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 14: 208-14.
- Chikusa Masaaki 竺沙雅章. 1993. *Kanyaku Daizōkyō no Rekishi: Shakyō kara Kankyō e* 漢訳大蔵經の歴史—写經から刊經へ— [The history of the Chinese canon: from manuscript to printed text] (Kyoto: Ōtani Daigaku 大谷大学).
- Childers, Robert Caesar. 1909. *A Dictionary of the Pali Language* (London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Reprint: Rangoon: Buddha Sāsana Council Press, 1974).
- Chimpa, Lama and Alaka Chattopadhyaya. 1980. *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India* (Calcutta: K P Bagchi & Company).
- Cleary, Thomas. 1984-87. *The Flower Ornament Scripture: The Avatamsaka Sutra Translated from the Chinese* (Boulder & London: Shambala). 3 volumes.
- Cone, Margaret. 1989. "Patna Dharmapada." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 13: 101-217.
- Conze, Edward. 1975. *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom* (Berkeley: University of California Press. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979).
- Cowell, Edward Byles, et al., 1895-1907. *The Jātaka, or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1981). 6 volumes.
- Cowell, Edward Byles and Robert Alexander Neil. 1886. *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge; Reprint: Amsterdam: Oriental Press / Philo Press, 1970).
- Daizōkai 大蔵会 (ed.). 1964. *Daizōkyō: Seiritsu to Hensen* 大蔵經—成立と変遷— (Reprint: Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑, 1989).
- Dantinne, Jean. 1983. *La Splendeur de l'Inébranlable (Akṣobhyavyūha)*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 29 (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain).
- . 1991. *Les Qualités de l'Ascète (Dhutaḡaṇa): Etude sémantique et Doctrinale* (Brussels: Thanh-Long).
- Das, Rahul Peter. 1988. *Das Wissen von der Lebensspanne der Bäume: Surapāla's Vṛkṣāyurveda*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 34 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag).

- Das, Rai Sarat Chandra. 1902. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Book Depot).
- Dave, Jayantakṛṣṇa Harikṛṣṇa. 1975. *Manusmṛtiḥ: Medhātithi-Sarvajñānārāyaṇa-Kullūka-Rāghavānanda-Nandana-Rāmacandra-Manirāma-Govindarāja-Bhāruci iti vyākhyānavakena samalambitā*. Dvitiyo vibhāgaḥ (3-4 adhyāyātmakah). Bhāratīyavidyā-śreṇī-granṭha 33 (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan).
- Davidson, Ronald Mark. 1985. "Buddhist Systems of Transformation: *Āśraya-parivṛtti* / *-parāvṛtti* Among the Yogācāra." Doctoral Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Dayal, Har. 1932. *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.).
- de Jong, Jan Willem. 1974. "Notes on the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* of the Mahāsāṅghikas." L. Cousins (ed.) *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I. B. Horner* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel): 63-70. Reprinted in *Buddhist Studies by J. W. de Jong*. Gregory Schopen (ed.) (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1979): 297-304.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1920. Review of Leumann 1919. *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 20 / 4: 158-70.
- . 1925. "Les Versions Chinoises du Milindapañha." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 24: 1-258.
- . 1932. "L'origin des sectes bouddhiques d'après Paramārtha." *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 1: 15-64. Reprinted in Demiéville 1973: 81-130.
- . 1934-36. Review of Tsiang Wei-sin, *Kin tsang t'iao yin che mo k'ao* (*Etude historique sur la gravure et l'impression du Canon Bouddhique des Kin*). In *Bibliographie Bouddhique VII-VIII* (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve): item 377, pages 112-14.
- . 1951. "A Propos du Concile de Vaiśālī." *T'oung Pao* 40 / 4-5: 239-96.
- . 1953. "Notes additionnelles sur les éditions imprimées du Canon bouddhique." Appendix to Pelliot 1953: 121-38. Reprinted in Demiéville 1973: 223-40.
- . 1954. "La Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 44 / 2: 339-436.
- . 1973. *Choix d'Études Bouddhiques (1929-1970)* (Leiden: E. J. Brill).
- Demoto Mitsuyo 出本充代. 1991. "'Avadāna-shataka' ni tsuite" 『アヴァダーナ・シャタカ』について, [On the *Avadānaśataka*]. M.A. Thesis, Department of Sanskrit, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University.

- Deo, Shantaram Bhalchandra. 1956. *History of Jaina Monachism: From Inscriptions and Literature* (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute).
- Derrett, John Duncan Martin. 1983. *A Textbook for Novices: Jayaraksita's «Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrīghana»*. Pubblicazioni di «Indologica Taurinensia» 15 (Torino: Indologica Taurinensia).
- Desgodins, Auguste. 1899. *Dictionnaire Thibétain-Latin-Français par Les Missionnaires Catholiques du Thibet* (Hong Kong: Imprimerie de la Société des Missions Étrangères).
- Dhirasekera, Jotiya. 1982. *Buddhist Monastic Discipline: A study of its origin and development in relation to the Sutta and Vinaya Pitakas* (Colombo: Ministry of Higher Education Research Publication Series).
- Dickson, J. F. 1875. "The Upasampadā-Kammavācā being the Buddhist Manual of the Form and Manner of Ordering of Priests and Deacons. The Pāli Text, with a Translation and Notes." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, new series vol 7: 1-16.
- Doniger, Wendy. 1981. *The Rig Veda: An Anthology* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books).
- , and Brian K. Smith. 1991. *The Laws of Manu* (London: Penguin Books).
- Donner, Neal Arvid, and Daniel B. Stevenson. 1993. *The Great Calming and Contemplation: A Study and Annotated Translation of the First Chapter of Chih-i's Mo-ho chih-kuan*. Kuroda Institute Classics in East Asian Buddhism (Honolulu: Kuroda Institute / University of Hawaii Press).
- Dundas, Paul. 1992. *The Jains* (London: Routledge).
- Durt, Hubert. 1991. "Bodhisattva and Layman in the Early Mahāyāna." *Japanese Religions* 16 / 3: 1-16.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1930. *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relation to Hīnayāna*. Calcutta Oriental Series 23 (London: Luzac & Co.).
- . 1931. "Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa Sūtra." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 7: 259-86.
- . 1934. *The Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. Calcutta Oriental Series 28 (London: Luzac & Co.).
- . 1939-59. *Gilgit Manuscripts* (Srinagar and Calcutta: J. C. Sarkhel at the Calcutta Oriental Press.). Four volumes in nine parts.
- . 1978. *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works 7 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute).

- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary* (New Haven: Yale University Press). 2 volumes.
- Eggeling, Julius. 1882. *The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, According to the Text of the Mādhyandina School*. Part I. Books I and II. The Sacred Books of the East 12 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965).
- Ehara, N. R. M., Soma Thera and Kheminda Thera. 1961. *The Path of Freedom, By the Arahant Upatissa* (Colombo. Reprinted: Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1977).
- Eimer, Helmut. 1983. *Rab Tu 'Byuñ Ba'i Gzi*. Asiatische Forschungen 82 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz). 2 volumes.
- Ensink, Jacob. 1952. *The Question of Rāṣṭrapāla* (Zwolle: J.J. Tijl).
- Feer, Léon. 1884-98. *The Saṃyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka* (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1973-76). 5 volumes.
- . 1891. *Avadāna-Çataka: Cents Legendes Bouddhiques*. Annales du Musee Guimet 18 (Paris; Reprint: Amsterdam: APA Oriental Press, 1979).
- Filliozat, Jean. 1945. "Charity in Indian Thought." English translation of French original, in Filliozat 1991: 3-17. Originally "La charité dans la monde indien." *Cahiers de la vie spirituelle. L'Amour du prochain* (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf): 327-45.
- . 1950. "Maitreya l'Invaincu." *Journal Asiatique*: 145-49. Reprinted in *Laghuprabandhāḥ: Choix d'Articles d'Indologie par Jean Filliozat* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974): 123-27.
- . 1964a. *The Classical Doctrine of Indian Medicine*. Dev Raj Chanana, trans. (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal).
- . 1964b. "Śikṣāsamuccaya et Sūtrasamuccaya." *Journal Asiatique* 252 / 4: 473-78.
- . 1980. "Punya and its Semantic Field." English translation of French original, in Filliozat 1991: 233-51. Originally "Sur le domaine sémantique de punya." In *Indianisme et Bouddhisme: Mélanges offerts à Mgr Étienne Lamotte*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 23 (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste): 101-10.
- . 1991. *Religion, Philosophy, Yoga: A Selection of Articles by Jean Filliozat*. Translated from the French by Maurice Shukla (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).
- Finot, Louis. 1901. *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā: Sūtra du Mahāyāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica II (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Indo-Iranian Reprints II. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1957).

- , and Édouard Huber. 1913. "Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins." *Journal Asiatique* 11th series, vol 2: 465-558.
- Forte, Antonino. 1976. *Political Propoganda and Ideology in China at the End of the Seventh Century* (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, Seminario di Studi Asiatici).
- Foucaux, Phillipe Édouard. 1847. *Rgya Tch'er Rol Pa ou Développement des Jeux, Contenant l'Histoire du Bouddha Çakya-mouni. Première Partie — Texte Tibétain* (Paris: Imprimerie Royale).
- Franco, Eli. 1993. Review of Sakuma 1990. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 36: 343-49.
- Frye, Stanley. 1981. *The Sutra of the Wise and the Foolish (mdo bdzans blun) or The Ocean of narratives (üliger-ün dalai)* (Dharamsala: The Library of Tibetan Works and Archives).
- Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃. 1981. "Kaisho no Seitai" 楷書の生態 [The Ecology of the Kai Style of Writing]. In *Nihongo no Sekai 日本語の世界 3: Chūgoku no Kanji 中国の漢字* (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha 中央公論社): 288-334.
- . 1990. "Dunhuang yishu zhi jinqi" 敦煌遺書之今期. In *Dunhuang tulupanxue yanjiu lunwenji* 敦煌吐魯番學研究論文集, edited by Zhonghua dunhuang tulupan xuehui 中国敦煌吐魯番学会 (Shanghai: Hanyūdacidian chubanshe 漢語大詞典出版社): 12ff.
- Fujita Kōkan 藤田光寛. 1988. "'Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra' ni tsuite" <Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra>について [On the Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra]. *Mikkyō Bunka* 密教文化 163: 132-117 [sic].
- Fujita Kōtatsu 藤田宏達. 1970. *Genshi Jōdo Shisō no Kenkyū* 原始淨土思想の研究 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店).
- . 1975. *Bonbun Wayaku Muryōjukyō - Amidakyō* 梵文和訳無量寿經・阿彌陀經 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館).
- Fussman, Gérard. 1977. "Pour une problématique nouvelle des religions indiennes anciennes." *Journal Asiatique* 265: 21-70.
- Gangadharan, N. 1985. *The Agni Purāṇa. Part II. Ancient Indian Tradition and Mythology* 28 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).
- Geiger, Wilhelm Ludwig. 1912. *The Mahāvamsa or The Great Chronicle of Ceylon*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 3 (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint, 1980).
- . 1943. *Pāli Literature and Language*. Trans. by Batakrishna Ghosh. (Calcutta: University of Calcutta. Reprint: Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1978).

- Gernet, Jacques. 1956. *Les Aspects Économiques du Bouddhisme dans la Société Chinoise du Ve au Xe Siècle*. Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient 39 (Paris: École Française d'Extrême Orient).
- Ghoṣa, Pratāpacandra. 1902-13. *Çatasāhasrikā-Prajñā-Pāramitā: A Theological and Philosophical Discourse of Buddha with thie Disciples (In a Hundred Thousand Stanzas)* (Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press).
- Giles, Lionel. 1957. *Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tunhuang in the British Museum* (London: The Trustees of the British Museum).
- Gnoli, Raniero. 1977-78. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Sanghabhedavastu*. Serie Orientale Roma 49 / 1-2 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente). 2 volumes.
- . 1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu: Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Serie Orientale Roma 50 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).
- Gombrich, Richard. 1988. "How the Mahāyāna Began." *Pārigaku Bukkyō Bunkagaku* パーリ学仏教文化学 / *Journal of Pali and Buddhist Studies* 1: 29-46.
- Gómez, Luis Oscar. 1977. "The Bodhisattva as Wonder-worker." In Lewis Lancaster, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems: Studies in honor of Edward Conze*. Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 1 (Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series): 221-61.
- , and Jonathan A. Silk. 1989. *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts*. Michigan Studies in Buddhist Literature 1 (Ann Arbor: Collegiate Institute for the Study of Buddhist Literature and Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan).
- Gonda, Jan. 1952. *Ancient-Indian ojas, Latin *augos and the Indo-European Nouns in -es / -os* (Utrecht: N.V.A. Oosthoek's Uitgevers Mij.).
- . 1965. *Change and Continuity in Indian Religion*. Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae 9 (The Hague: Mouton & Co.).
- 'Gos gzhon nu dpal. 1985. *Deb ther sngon po* (Chengdu: Sichuan Minzu Chubanshe 四川民族出版社). [The author's name is given in Chinese as Guo Xunnubai 郭循努白.] 2 volumes.
- Goshima Kiyotaka 五島清隆. 1986. "Daibadatta denshō to Daijō kyōten" 提婆達多伝承と大乘経典 [The Devadatta Legend and Mahāyāna scriptures]. *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū* 佛教史学研究 28 / 2: 51-69.
- . 1981. *The Tibetan Text of the Brahmapariprocchā (Brahmaviśeṣacintipari-prcchā)*. Volume I (Tib. bam po dan po) (Takatsuki-shi, Japan: Goshima Kiyotaka).

- Grinstead, E. D. 1967. "The manuscript Kanjur in the British Museum," *Asia Major* (n.s.) 13 / 1-2: 48-70.
- Gunawardana, R. A. L. H. 1979. *Robe and Plough: Monasticism and Economic Interest in Early Medieval Sri Lanka*. The Association for Asian Studies: Monographs and Papers 35 (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press).
- Halbfass, Wilhelm. 1988. *India and Europe: An Essay in Understanding* (Albany: State University of New York Press).
- Harrison, Paul Maxwell. 1978. *The Tibetan text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra*. Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series I (Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library).
- . 1987. "Who Gets to Ride in the Great Vehicle? Self-Image and Identity Among the Followers of the Early Mahāyāna." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 10 / 1: 67-89.
- . 1990. *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present: An Annotated English Translation of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra*. Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series V (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies).
- . 1993. "The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: Some Notes on the Works of Lokakṣema." *Buddhist Studies Review* 10 / 2: 135-77.
- . Unpublished. "Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What Are We Looking For?" (A Public Lecture delivered at Ōtani University, Kyōto, in 1992.)
- Härtel, Herbert. 1956. *Karmavācānā: Formulare für den Gebrauch im buddhistischen Gemeindeleben aus ostturkistanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 3. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientalforschung, Veröffentlichung 30 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
- Hayashiya Tomojirō 林屋友次郎. 1941. *Kyōroku Kenkyū (Zenpen) 經錄研究 (前篇)* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店).
- . 1945. *Iyaku Kyōrui no Kenkyū 異譯經類の研究* (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫).
- Hazra, Rajendra Chandra. 1940. *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. The University of Dacca Bulletin 20 (Dacca: The University of Dacca).
- Hecker, Hellmuth. 1987. *Lives of the Disciples: Maha Kassapa: Father of the Sangha*. Revised and enlarged translation from the German by Nyanaponika Thera. Wheel Publication 345 (Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society).

- Hikata Ryūshō 干潟龍祥. 1958. *Suvikrāntavikrāmi-pariprcchā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (Fukuoka. reprint: Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company, 1983. Rinsen Buddhist Text Series 3).
- . 1973a. “Meshia-shisō to Miraibutsu Miroku no shinkō ni tsuite” メシア思想と未来仏弥勒の信仰について. *Nippon Gakushiin Kiyō* 日本學士院紀要 31/ 1: 35-43.
- . 1973b. “Miroku shinkō no keika no Kōbō Daishi Tosotsu ōjō no den ni tsuite” 弥勒信仰の経過と弘法大師兜率往生の伝について. *Mikkyōgaku Kenkyū* 密教学研究 5: 1-18.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1954. “Daijō Bukkyō no Kyōdanshiteki Seikaku” 大乘仏教の教団史的 성격. In Miyamoto 1954: 447-82. Reprinted in Hirakawa 1989b: 375-414. I refer to the reprint edition.
- . 1957. “Jajūbibasharon no Chosha ni tsuite” 十住毘婆沙論の著者について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 5 / 2. Reprinted in Hirakawa 1989c: 89-99.
- . 1963. “The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and its Relationship to the Worship of Stupas.” *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 22: 57-106.
- . 1968. *Shoki Daijō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 初期大乘仏教の研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社). Hirakawa 1989a, 1990a is a revised edition of this study.
- . 1970. *Ritsuzō no Kenkyū* 律蔵の研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō 山喜房).
- . 1972. “Kesa ni tsuite” 袈裟について [On the *kāṣāya*]. In Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 and Umehara Takeshi 梅原猛, eds., *Hana Samazama: Yamada Mumon Rōshi Koki Kinenshū* 花さまざま—山田無文老子古希記念集 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社): 101-21.
- . 1981. “Butsumetsugo no Kyōdan ni okeru Anan no ichi: Budda jidai no chū-into no chiri” 仏滅後の教団における阿難の位置—仏陀時代の中インドの地理. *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 10. Reprinted in *Genshi Bukkyō to Abidaruma Bukkyō* 原始仏教とアビダルマ仏教, Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 2 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社, 1991): 141-66. My references are to the reprint.
- . 1982. *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns: An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 21 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).
- . 1983. “Mañjuśrī and the Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism.” *Journal of Asian Studies* (Madras) 1 / 1: 12-33.
- . 1989a. *Shoki Daijō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 初期大乘仏教の研究 I. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 3 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

- . 1989b. *Daijō Bukkyō no Kyōri to Kyōdan* 大乘仏教の教理と教団. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 5 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- . 1989c. *Shoki Daijō to Hokke Shisō* 初期大乘と法華思想. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 6 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- . 1990a. *Shoki Daijō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 初期大乘仏教の研究 II. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 4 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- . 1990b. *A History of Indian Buddhism: From Śākyamuni to Early Mahāyāna*. Translated and Edited by Paul Groner. Asian Studies at Hawaii 36 (Hawaii: The University of Hawaii Press).
- , et al. 1973. 1977. 1978. *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (P. Pradhan Edition)* (Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan). 3 volumes.
- Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 1988. “Jōdo Kyōten ni mirareu nishu no Segansetsu: ‘Muryōju-kyō’ o chūshin to shite” 浄土經典にみられる二種の誓願説—く無量寿経>を中心として—. *Bukkyō Daigaku Daigakuin Kenkyū Kiyō* 佛教大學大學院研究紀要 16: 37-64.
- . 1991. “The Relation between the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: The Case of *Divyāvadāna* Chapter 31.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 39 / 2: 17-19 (= 1038-1036 [sic]).
- Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire Encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d’après les Sources Chinoises et Japonaises*. 1929-. (Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise).
- Hoernle, August Friedrich Rudolf. 1916. *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan* (Oxford; Reprint: St. Leonards: Ad Orientem Ltd. / Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1970).
- Horner, Isaline Blew. 1938-66. *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya Piṭaka)* (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1982-86). 6 volumes.
- . 1954-59. *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings (Majjhima-nikāya)* (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1976-77). 3 volumes.
- . 1963, 1964. *Milinda’s Questions*. Sacred Books of the Buddhists 22, 23 (Reprint: Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1990, 1991). 2 volumes.
- Huang Bingzhang 黄炳章. 1986. “Hōsan Unkyōji Sekikyō” 房山雲居寺石經 (The Stone Scriptures in Yunju Monastery at Fang Mountain). Translated by Kegasawa Yasunori 氣賀沢保規. *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū* 佛教史學研究 29 / 2: 111-33.
- Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 1991. “Das Anschlagen der *Gandī* in buddhistischen Klöstern: über einige einschlägige Vinaya-Termini.” In Li Zheng 李鍾 et al., eds., *Ji Xianlin Jiaoshou Bashi Huadan Jinian Lunwenji* 季羨林教授八十華誕記念論文

- 集 / *Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*, 2 volumes (Jiangxi: Jiangxi renmin chubanshe 江西人民出版社): II.737-68.
- Huth, Georg. 1891. *Die Tibetische Version der Naihsargikapṛāyaçcittikadharmās: Buddhistische Sühnregeln aus dem Pratimokshasūtram* (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner).
- Ichishima Masao 一島正真. 1986. "'Shūjū shidai' to 'Daijō Hōyō Giron' to no Kankei" 『修習次第』と『大乘宝要義論』との関係 [The Relationship between the *Bhāvanākrama* and the *Sūtrasamuccaya*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 35 / 1: 27-31.
- Imaeda, Yoshiro. 1982a. "L'Edition du Kanjur tibetain de 'Jang sa-tham,'" *Journal Asiatique* 270 / 1-2: 173-89.
- . 1982b, 1984. *Catalogue du Kanjur tibetain de l'Edition de 'Jang sa-tham*, Bibliotheca Philologica Buddhica, Series Maior, Ila & Iib (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies).
- Inagaki, Hisao. 1984. *A Tri-Lingual Glossary of the Sūkṇāvavīvyūha Sūtras* (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshodo).
- Ishihama, Yumiko and Yoichi Fukuda. 1989. *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvvyutpatti*. *Studia Tibetica* 16. Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries 1. (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko).
- Itō Tsukasa 伊藤丈. 1982. "Zōjōji-zō Sōhan Daizōkyō ni tsuite" 増上寺蔵宋版大蔵經について [On the Song edition of the Buddhist canon preserved in Zōjōji]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 31 / 1: 146-47.
- Iwamoto Yutaka 岩本裕. 1968. *Sumāgadhāvadāna*. Studien zur buddhistischen Erzählliteratur 2 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan).
- . 1979. *Sumāgadā Avadāna Kenkyū* 『スマーガダー=アヴァダーナ』研究. *Bukkyō Setsuwa Kenkyū* 佛教説話研究 5 (Tokyo: Kaimei shoin 開明書院).
- Jacobi, Hermann. 1884, 1895. *Gaina Sūtras*. The Sacred Books of the East 22, 45 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Reprinted: New York: Dover Publications, 1968). 2 volumes.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. 1988. "Stages in the Bodhisattva Career of the Tathāgata Maitreya." In *Maitreya, the Future Buddha*. A. Sponberg and H. Hardacre, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 54-90.
- Jambūvijaya, Muni. 1989. *Nāyādharmakāhō*. Jaina-Āgama-Series 5, part 1. (Bombay: Shri Mahāvira Jaina Vidyālaya).

- Jamkhedkar, Aravinda Prabhakar. 1984. *Vasudevahimḍī: A Cultural Study* (Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan).
- Jäschke, Heinrich August. 1881. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Ji Xianlin 季羨林 et al. 1985. *Datang Xiyuji Jiaozhu* 大唐西域記校注 (Peking: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局).
- Jinananda, B. 1969. *Abhisamācārikā (Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka)*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 9 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Johnston, E. H. 1928, 1932. *The Saudarananda of Aśvaghōṣa* (London; Reprint: Delhi: Motilala Banarsidass, 1975).
- . 1950. *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantrasāstra* (Patna: Bihar Research Society).
- Jolly, Julius. 1880. *The Institutes of Vishnu. The Sacred Books of the East 7* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Reprinted: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965).
- . 1881. *Viṣṇusmṛtiḥ: The Institutes of Vishnu: Together with Extracts from the Sanskrit Commentary of Nanda Paṇḍit called Vaijayanti* (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society. Reprint: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 95. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1962).
- Kaelber, Walter O. 1981. "The *Brahmacārin*: Homology and Continuity in Brāhmaṇic Religion." *History of Religions* 21 / 1: 77-99.
- Kagawa Takao 香川孝雄. 1984. *Muryōjukyō no Shohon Taishō Kenkyū* 無量寿經の諸本對照研究 (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō 永田文昌堂).
- Kajiyama Yuichi 梶山雄一. 1982. "On the Meanings of the Words *Bodhisattva* and *Mahāsattva* in Prajñāpāramitā Literature." In L. A. Hercus et al., eds. *Indo-logical and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies): 253-70. Reprinted in Katsumi Mimaki, ed., *Y. Kajiyama, Studies in Buddhist Philosophy (Selected Papers)* (Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 1989): 71-88.
- , et al. 1994. *Satori e no Henreki: Kegonkyō Nyūhokkaibon* さとりへの遍歴・華嚴經入法界品 [The *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*] (Tokyo: Chūōkōronsha 中央公論社). Two volumes. [Translated by Kajiyama, Tanji Teruyoshi 丹治昭義, Tsuda Shin'ichi 津田真一, Tamura Chijun 田村智淳, and Katsura Shōryū 桂紹隆.]
- Kajiyoshi Kōun 梶芳光運. 1980. *Daijō Bukkyō no Seiritsushiteki Kenkyū (Genshi Hannyakyō no Kenkyū sono ichi)* 大乘仏教の成立史的研究 (原始般若經の研究その一) (Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房仏書林).

- Kamibayashi Ryūjō 神林隆淨. 1939. *Bosatsu Shisō no Kenkyū* 菩薩思想の研究 [A Study on the Idea of the Bodhisattva] (Tokyo: Morie shoten 森江書店).
- Kane, Pandurang Vaman. 1968-1977. *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Medieval Religious and Civil Law in India)*. Second Edition. Government Oriental Series B 6 (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental research Institute). 5 volumes.
- Karashima, Seishi. 1992. *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*. Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 3 (Tokyo: The Sankibo Press).
- Kawaguchi Kōfū 川口高風. 1974. "Shibunritsu Gyōjishō ni arawareta in'yō tenseki no kenkyū: Kyōronbu" 四分律行事鈔にあらわれた引用典籍の研究・経論部. *Sōtōshū Kenkyūin Kenkyūsei Kenkyūkiyō* 曹洞宗研究院研究生研究紀要 6: 132-114 (sic).
- . 1975. "Shibunritsu Gyōjishō ni arawareta in'yō tenseki no kenkyū: Ritsubu" 四分律行事鈔にあらわれた引用典籍の研究・律部. *Komazawa Daigaku Daigakuin Bukkyōgaku Kenkyūkai Nenpō* 駒沢大学大学院仏教学研究會年報 9: 25-59.
- Kent, Stephen A. 1982. "A Sectarian Interpretation of the Rise of Mahayana." *Religion* 12: 311-32.
- Kern, Hendrik. 1884. *The Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, or The Lotus of the True Law*. Sacred Books of the East 21 (Oxford: Clarendon Press. I have used a reprint of 1909).
- . 1903. *Histoire de Bouddhisme dans l'Inde*. Translated by Gédéon Huet, Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études 11, volume 2 (Paris: Ernest Leroux).
- , and Bunyiu Nanjio. 1908-12. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 10 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- Khoroche, Peter. 1989. *Once the Buddha Was a Monkey: Ārya Śūra's Jātakamāla* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press).
- Kimura Senshō 木村宣彰. 1982. "Miroku shinkō ni tsuite: 'Kanmirokubosatsujōshō-tosotsuten-kyō' no kōsatsu" 弥勒信仰について・『観弥勒菩薩上生兜率天經』の考察. *Ōtani Gakuhō* 大谷学報 62 / 4: 57-59.
- . 1983. "Mirokubutsu no shusse ni tsuite: toku no sono jissetsu o chūshin ni" 弥勒佛の出世について・特にその時節を中心に. *Bukkyōgaku Seminā* 佛教學セミナー 37: 31-42.
- Kimura, Takayasu. 1986. *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā II - III* (Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin Publishing).

- Kondo Ryūkō 近藤隆晃. 1936. *Daśabhūmiśvaro nāma Mahāyānasūtram* (Tokyo. Reprint: Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company, 1986. Rinsen Buddhist Text Series 2).
- Kosambi, D. D. 1963. "Combined Methods in Indology," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 6/ 3-4: 177-202.
- Krishan, Y. 1969. "Was it permissible for a *saṃnyāsī* (monk) to revert to lay life?" *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 50: 75-89.
- Kubo, Tsugunari and Akira Yuyama. 1991. *The Lotus Sutra: The White Lotus of the Marvelous Law*. BDK English Tripitaka 13-1 (Tokyo & Berkeley: Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai).
- Kumoi Shōzen 雲井昭善. 1992. *Mirai no Hotoke 未来のほとけ* [The Future Buddha] Bukkyō Daigaku Shijō Sentā Sōsho 仏教大学四条センター叢書 1 (Osaka: Sōkyō shuppan 創教出版).
- Lalou, Marcelle. 1939. *Inventaire des Manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 1 (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve).
- . 1953. "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroñ-lde-bcan." *Journal Asiatique* 241: 313-53.
- Lamotte, Étienne Paul Marie. 1935. *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra: L'Explication des Mystères*. Université de Louvain, Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie 2e Série, 34e Fascicule (Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil / Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve).
- . 1944-80. *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 25, 26, 2, 12, 24 (Louvain: Université de Louvain; reprint, 1970-81). 5 volumes.
- . 1954. "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna." In Johannes Schubert and Ulrich Schneider, eds., *Asiatica: Festschrift Friedrich Weller* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz): 377-96.
- . 1955. "Le bouddhisme des Laïcs." In Nagao Gajin 長尾雅人 and Nozawa Jōshō 野澤静證, eds., *Yamaguchi Hakase Kanreki Kinen: Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Ronsō* 山口博士還暦記念・印度学仏教学論叢 / *Studies in Indology and Buddhology: Presented in Honour of Professor Susumu Yamaguchi on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館): 73-89. (This is virtually repeated in Lamotte 1958: 71-92.)
- . 1958. *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien, des Origines à l'ère Śaka*, Bibliothèque du Muséon 43; Reprint Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 14 (Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1976).
- . 1962. *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa)*. Bibliothèque du Muséon 51 (Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste).

- . 1975. *La Concentration de la Marche Héroïque (Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra)*. Mélanges chinois et bouddhique 13 (Bruxelles: Institut Belge des hautes Études Chinoises).
- . 1988. *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śāka Era*. Translated by Sara Webb-Boin. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 36 (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain Institut Orientaliste). English version of Lamotte 1958.
- Lancaster, Lewis. 1969. "The Chinese Translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* Attributed to Chi Ch'ien 支謙." *Monumenta Serica* 28: 246-57.
- . 1989. "The Rock Cut Canon in China: Findings at Fang-Shan." In Tadeusz Skorupski ed., *The Buddhist Heritage: Papers delivered at the Symposium of the same name convened at the School of Oriental and African Studies University of London, November 1985*. Buddhica Britannica Series Continua 1 (Tring: The Institute of Buddhist Studies): 143-56.
- , and Sung-bae Park. 1979. *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press).
- Laufer, Berthold. 1917. "Origin of the word Shaman." *American Anthropologist* 19 / 3: 361-71.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1901-14. *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā, Prajñākaramati's Commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra of Āntideva*. Bibliotheca Indica 983, 1031, 1090, 1126, 1139, 1305, 1399 (Calcutta: Asiatic Society).
- . 1903-13. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- . 1909a. *Bouddhisme: Opinions sur l'Histoire de la Dogmatique*. Études sur l'Histoire des Religions 2 (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne & Cie.).
- . 1909b. "Notes sur le Grand Véhicule." *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 59: 338-48.
- . 1923-31. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu* (Paris: Geuthner; Reprint *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 16, Bruxelles: Institut Belge des hautes Études Chinoises, 1971).
- . 1925. "Notes Bouddhiques VI §3: Notes sur le chemin du Nirvāṇa: Les Fidèles Laïcs ou Upāsakas." *Académie Royale de Belgique: Bulletins de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, 5e série, tome 11: 15-34.
- . 1928. "Les neuf Kalpas qu'a franchis Śākyamuni pour devancer Maitreya." *T'oung pao* 26 / 1: 17-24.

- . 1928-29. *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi: La Siddhi de Hiuan-Tsang*. Buddhica Première série: Mémoires, tome 1, 5 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner). 2 volumes.
- . 1929. "Notes Bouddhiques VII: Le Vinaya et la Pureté d'Intention," and "Note Additionnelle." *Académie Royale de Belgique: Bulletins de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, 5e série, tome 15: 201-17, and 233-34.
- . 1930. "Notes Bouddhiques XVIII: Opinions sur les Relations des deux Véhicules au point de vue du Vinaya." *Académie Royale de Belgique: Bulletins de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, 5e série, tome 16: 20-39.
- . 1937. "Staupikam." *Harvard Journal of Asian Studies* 2: 276-89.
- . 1962. *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-Huang in the India Office Library* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Lefmann, Salomon. 1902-08. *Lalita Vistara: Leben und Lehre des Çākya-Buddha* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. Reprint: Tokyo: Michō-Fukyū-kai, 1977). 2 vols.
- Legge, James. 1886. *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms, Being an Account by the Chinese Monk Fā-hien of his Travels in India and Ceylon (A.D. 399-414) in search of the Buddhist Books of Discipline* (Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprint: New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp. and Dover Publications, 1965).
- Leumann, Ernest. 1919. *Maitreya-samiti, das Zukunftsideal der Buddhisten*. Part 2 (pp. 161-282). (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner).
- , and Walther Schubring. 1932. *The Dasaveyāliya Sutta* (Ahmedabad: The Managers of Sheth Anandji Kalianji. Reprint: Schubring 1977: 109-248).
- , and Shiraishi Shindō. See Shiraishi 1957.
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1907. *Mahāyāna-Sūtrālamkāra: Exposé de la Doctrine du Grand Véhicule, Selon le Système Yogācāra*. Tome I: Texte. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études: Sciences Historiques et Philologiques 159 (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion; Reprint: Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company, 1983).
- . 1929. "L'Inscription de Mahānāman à Bodh-Gaya: Essai d'exégèse appliquée à l'épigraphie bouddhique." *Indian Studies in honour of Charles Rockwell Lanman* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press): 35-47.
- . 1932a. "Maitreya le Consolateur." *Études d'Orientalisme publiées par Le Musée Guimet à la mémoire de Raymonde Linossier*. Vol. II (Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux): 355-402.

- . 1932b. *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karma-vibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga)*. (Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux).
- , and Édouard Chavannes. 1915. "Quelques titres énigmatiques dans la hiérarchie ecclésiastique du bouddhisme indien." *Journal Asiatique* 11th series, vol. 5: 193-223, vol. 6: 307-10.
- . 1916. "Les Seize Arhat Protecteurs de la Loi." *Journal Asiatique* 11th series, vol. 7: 5-50; 189-304.
- Limaye, V. P., and R. D. Vadekar. 1958. *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*. Volume 1 (Poona: Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala).
- Lin, Li-kouang. 1949. *L'Aide-Mémoire de la Vraie Loi (Saddharma-Smṛtyupasthāna-Sūtra)*. Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale, Publications du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études, Tome 54 (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve).
- Lokesh Chandra. 1981. *Collected Works of Jaya-Paṇḍita Blo-bzañ-hphrin-las*. Volume 4. Śāta-Piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures 281 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture).
- Lüders, Heinrich. 1954. *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des Buddhistischen Urkanons*. Edited by Ernst Waldschmidt. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1952 Nr. 10 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
- MacQueen, Graeme. 1981, 1982. "Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism." *Religion* 11: 303-19, 12: 49-65.
- Maeda Egaku 前田惠學. 1964. *Genshi Bukkyō Seiten no Seiritsushi Kenkyū* 原始佛教聖典の成立史研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林).
- Maeda Eun 前田慧雲. 1903. *Daijō Bukkyō Shiron* 大乘佛教史論 (Tokyo: Bunmeidō 文明堂).
- Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮. 1976. *Gikyō Kenkyū* 疑經研究 (Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūsho 京都大学人文科学研究所).
- Malalasekera, G.P. 1938. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* (London: Pali Text Society). 2 volumes.
- Malmoud, Charles. 1976. "Village et forêt dans l'idéologie de l'Inde brāhmanique." *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 17: 3-20.
- Masefield, Peter. 1986. *Divine Revelation in Pali Buddhism* (Colombo: The Sri Lanka Institute of Traditional Studies / London: George Allen & Unwin).

- Matsuda Shidō 松田真道. 1979a. "Nanden Daizōkyō ni okeru Genzoku" 南伝大蔵經における還俗 [Returning to the laity in the Pāli canon]. *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 52 / 3: 220-222 (480-82).
- . 1979b. "Taishō zōkyō Indo senjutsu-bu ni okeru Genzoku" 大正藏經印度撰述部における還俗 [Returning to the laity in the texts of Indic origin in the Chinese canon]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 28 / 1: 341-43.
- . 1981a. "Indo Bukkyō kyōdan-shi ni okeru Genzoku no Dōki" インド佛教教団史における還俗の動機 [The motivation for returning to the laity in the history of the Indian Buddhist community]. *Sōtōshū Kenkyūin Kenkyūsei Kenkyū kiyō* 曹洞宗研究員研究生研究紀要 13: 234-48.
- . 1981b. "Indo Bukkyō kyōdan ni okeru Zaizokusha āramika no kōsatsu (jo)" インド佛教教団における在俗者 āramika の考察 (序) [On the lay āramika in the Indian Buddhist community]. *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 54 / 3: 264-65 (508-9).
- . 1981c. "Shitsujinin veyyāvaccakara to shu'ennin āramika" 執事人 veyyāvaccakara と守園人 āramika [Veyyāvaccakara and āramika]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 30 / 1: 124-25.
- . 1982a. "Indo Bukkyō kyōdan-shi ni okeru Jōnin no kōsatsu" インド佛教教団史における淨人の考察. [The Kappiyakāraka in the history of the Indian Buddhist community] *Sōtōshū Kenkyūin Kenkyūsei Kenkyū kiyō* 曹洞宗研究員研究生研究紀要 14: 137-54.
- . 1982b. "Vihāra-pāla to Jishu (vihāra-svāmin)" Vihāra-pāla と寺主 (vihāra-svāmin). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 31 / 1: 313-15.
- . 1983. "Indo Bukkyō kyōdan no Yakushoku no Kigen" インド佛教教団の役職の起源. [The origins of Saṅgha Officers in Indian Buddhist communities] *Sōtōshū Kenkyūin Kenkyūsei Kenkyū kiyō* 曹洞宗研究員研究生研究紀要 15: 114-31.
- Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎. 1911. *Miroku Jōdo-ron* 彌勒淨土論 (Tokyo: Heigo shuppansha 丙午出版社).
- . 1927. *Butten Hihyōron* 佛典批評論 (Kyoto: Kobundō 弘文堂).
- Matsumura, Hisashi. 1990. "Miscellaneous Notes on the Upāliparipṛcchā and Related Texts." *Acta Orientalia* 51: 61-113.
- Matsunaga Yūkei 松長有慶. 1991. "Indo Mikkyō ni okeru Sendara-kan" インド仏教における施陀羅覬 [The image of the caṇḍāla in Indian Tantric Literature]. *Kōyasan Daigaku Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 高野山大学密教文化研究所紀要 4: 1-20.
- Matsunami Seiren 松濤誠廉. 1975. "Bonbun Gattō Zanmaikyō" 梵文月灯三昧經. *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 60: 244-188, 61: 796-61.

- , et al. 1975. *Hokekyō* 法華經 I. *Daijō Butten* 大乘仏典 4 (Tokyo: Chūokōron-sha 中央公論社).
- Maurer, Walter H. 1986. *Pinnacles of India's Past: Selections from the Rgveda*. University of Pennsylvania Studies on South Asia 2 (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing).
- Mibu, Taishun. 1959. "A comparative list of the bkah-hgyur division of the Co-ne, Peking, Sde-dge and Snar-than editions." *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 44: 1-69.
- Michihata Ryōshū 道端良秀. 1966. *Kaitei Shinpan: Chūgoku Bukkyōshi* 改訂新版・中国仏教史 [Chinese Buddhism: Revised Edition] (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館).
- Minayeff, J. [Ivan Pavlovitch]. 1886. "Anāgata-varṇa." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1886: 33-53.
- Mitra, Veda. 1969. *Gautama Dharma Sūtra: With Maskari Bhashya* (New Delhi: Veda Mitra and Sons).
- Mitsukawa Toyoki 光川豊藝. 1988. "Shoki Daijō to 'Shōbōkujū' — toku ni 'Furōnae' to 'Butsuzōkyō' o chūshin ni" 初期大乘と「正法久住」—「富樓那会」と「仏藏經」を中心に [On the Active Bodhisattva and the Lazy Bhikṣu of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism]. *Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 佛教學研究 44: 1-25.
- . 1992. "'Butsuzōkyō' no Chūshakuteki Kenkyū: Rajūyaku to chibettoyaku nihon o chūshin ni shite" 『仏藏經』の注釈的研究・羅什訳とチベット訳二本を中心にして [An interpretative study of the *Buddhapitakaduḥśīlanirahī-sūtra*]. *Ryūkoku Daigaku Ronshū* 龍谷大學論集 441: 54-84.
- Miyamoto Shōson 宮本正尊. 1932. "Shin, shiki, funbetsu to konpon funbetsu" 心・識・分別と根本分別. [*citta, vijñāna, vikalpa* and the fundamental *vikalpa*] *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 9 / 5 (new series): 759-94.
- . 1954. *Daijō Bukkyō no Seiritsushiteki Kenkyū* 大乘仏教の成立史的研究 (Tokyo: Sanseidō 三成堂. Reprint of 1933 edition).
- Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元. 1981. *Hōkūkyō no Kenkyū* 法句經の研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- . 1993. "Chōrōge, Chōrōnige no Taiōhyō" 長老偈、長老尼偈の対応表 [A Comparative Table of the verses of the *Theragāthā* and *Therīgāthā*]. *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 22: 3-83.
- Mizuno Seiichi 水野清一 and Nagahiro Toshio 長広敏雄. 1941. *Ryūmon Sekkutsu no Kenkyū* 龍門石窟の研究 [A Study of the Buddhist Cave-Temples at Lung-mên, Ho-nan] (Tokyo: Zauhō Kankōkai 坐右寶刊行会).

- Mizuno Shinjō 水野真成. 1988². *Daitō Saiikiki* 大唐西域記. Chūgoku koten bungaku taikai 中国古典文学大系 22 (Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社).
- Mochizuki Ryōkō 望月良晃. 1969. "Daijō Shokyōron ni arawareta Arannyajū no Mondai" 大乘諸經論にあらわれた阿蘭若住の問題. *Ōzaki Gakuhō* 大崎学報 124: 66-93.
- . 1988. *Daijō Nehangyō no Kenkyū* 大乘涅槃經の研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨. 1932-36. *Bukkyō Daijiten* 佛教大辭典 (Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai 世界聖典刊行協会).
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).
- Mori Shōji 森章司. 1988. *Bukkyō Hiyu Reiwa Jiten* 仏教比喻例話辞典 (Tokyo: Tōkyōdō 東京堂).
- Mori, Sodō. 1982. "The Viṇḍavādins (Sophists) as seen in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās," in *Pāri Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyū* パーリ仏教文化研究, ed. Pāri Bunka Kenkyūkai パーリ仏教文化研究会 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林): 188-171 (sic).
- Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次. 1955-60. *Dai Kanwa Jiten* 大漢和辭典 (Tokyo: Daishūkan shoten 大修館書店). 13 volumes.
- Morris, Richard and Edmund Hardy. 1885-1900. *The Aṅguttara-Nikāya*. Second Edition, revised by A. K. Warder (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1961). 5 volumes.
- Mukai Akira 向井亮. 1978. "Yōgācyāra (yugagyō)-ha no gakuamei no yurai" ヨーガーチャラー (瑜伽行) 派の学派名の由来. [The origins of the name of the Yogācāra school] *Sanzō* 三蔵 153: originally distributed with the reprint edition of the *Kokuyaku Issaikyō*, *Ronshūbu* 國譯一切經・論集部 6. Reprinted in *Kokuyaku Issaikyō Indo Senjutsubu Geppō: Sanzōshū* 國譯一切經印度撰述部月報・三蔵集 4 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppan 大東出版, 1978): 267-73.
- Mukhopadhyaya, Sujitkumar. 1963. *The Aśokāvadāna: Sanskrit Text Compared with Chinese Versions* (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi).
- Müller, Edward [Éduard]. 1897. *The Atthasālinī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dhammasaṅgani*. Pali Text Society Text Series 12 (Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1979).
- . 1903. Review of Bendall 1897-1902. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*: 608-10.

- Müller, Frederich Max. 1901. *The Dhammapada: A Collection of Verses, being one of the canonical books of the Buddhists*. Sacred Books of the East 10 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons).
- Müller, Reinhold F.G. 1964. "Indische Würmerkrankheiten." *Gesnerus* 21: 14-22.
- Murakami Shinkan 村上真完. 1967. "Samādhirājasūtra no goi kenkyū" *Samādhirājasūtra* の語彙研究. *Hachinohe Kōgyō Kōtō Senmon Gakkō Kiyō* 八戸工業高等専門学校紀要 2: 72-109.
- Naudou, Jean. 1980. *Buddhists of Kaśmīr* (Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan. Original French edition, 1968).
- Nagai Makoto 長井眞琴. 1932. "Hōryōjue," 寶梁聚會 in *Kokuyaku Issaikyō Hōshakubu* 國譯一切經・寶積部 6 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppan 大東出版): 219-54.
- Nagao Gadjin 長尾雅人. 1973. "'Kashōbon' no shohon to 'Daihōshakukyō' Seiritsu no Mondai" 『迦葉品』の諸本と『大宝積經』成立の問題 [Some Problems of Several Versions of the *Kāśyapa-parivarta* and the Formation of the "Ta-pao-chi-ching"]. *Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan Kenkyū Nempō* 鈴木學術財団年報 10: 13-25.
- . 1982, 1987. *Shōdaijōron: Wayaku to Chūkai* 撰大乘論・和訳と注解. Indo Koten Sōsho インド古典叢書 (Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社). 2 volumes.
- . 1994. *An Index to Asaṅga's Mahāyānasamgraha*. *Studia Philologica Buddhica*, Monograph Series 9 (Tokyo: The International Institute of Buddhist Studies). 2 volumes.
- , and Sakurabe Hajime 桜部健. 1974. *Hōshakubu Kyōten* 宝積部經典. *Daijō Butten* 大乘仏典 9 (Tokyo: Chūokōronsha 中央公論社).
- Nagashima Shōdō 長島尚道. 1975. "Taishō Daigaku Shōzō Chibetto Daizōkyō: Narutan Kanjuru Mokuroku," 大正大学所蔵チベット大藏經・ナルタン版甘珠爾目錄 [A Catalogue of the Narthang Kanjur kept in Taishō University] *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 61: 1-35.
- Nakamura Hajime 中村元. 1981. *Bukkyōgo Daijiten* 仏教語大辞典 (Tokyo: Tōkyō Shoseki 東京書籍).
- Nakamura Zuiryū 中村瑞隆. 1976-. "Chibetto-yaku Hokekyō" チベット訳法華經. *Hokke Bunka Kenkyū* 法華文化研究 2 and following. Publication continues. Page numbers equal those of Kern and Nanjio 1908-12.
- Nakano Gishō 中野義照. 1935. "Daijō Shūbosatsu Gakuron," 大乘集菩薩學論 [*Śikṣā-samuccaya*]. In *Kokuyaku Issaikyō Yugabu* 國譯一切經・瑜伽部 11 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppan 大東出版): 1-244.

- Namai Chisho (Mamoru) 生井衛. 1967. "Kōki Bukkyōto ni yoru Bārhaspatya Hihan [I]," 後期仏教徒による Bārhaspatya 批判 [I] (The critique of Bārhaspatya Philosophy by later Buddhists). *Indo Gakuhō* インド学報 2: 29-74.
- Nanjio, Bunyiu. 1883. *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripi-taka: The Sacred Canon of the Buddhists in China and Japan* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).
- . 1923. *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1 (Reprint: Kyoto: Otani Univeristy Press, 1956).
- Nath, Vijay. 1987. *Dāna: Gift System in Ancient India (c. 600 BC. - c. AD. 300)* (New Delhi: Munishiram Manoharlal Publishers).
- Nattier, Jan. 1988. "The Meanings of the Maitreya Myth: A Typological Analysis." In A. Sponberg and H. Hardacre, eds., *Maitreya, the Future Buddha* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 23-47.
- . 1991. *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*. Nanzan Studies in Asian Religions 1 (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press).
- Németh, Julius. 1913-14. "Über den ursprung des Wortes Šaman." *Keleti Szemle: Közlemények az Ural-altaji Nép-és Nyelvtudomány Köréből* (Budapest) 14: 240-49.
- Nishi Giyū 西義雄. 1939. "Buha Bukkyō ni okeru Yugashi to sono Yakuwari" 部派仏教に於ける瑜伽師とその役割 [The yogācāra in Sectarian Buddhism and his role]. *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 3 / 1. Reprinted in Nishi 1975: 219-65.
- . 1974. "Buha Bukkyō Kyōdan Gojisha toshite no Yugagyōsha no Jissen" 部派仏教教団護持者としての瑜伽行者の実践 [The practice of the yogācāra as a protector of the Sectarian Buddhist community]. Extracted from the latter half of "Datsuma Izen no Indo no Denryū Kenkyū Josetsu" 達磨以前のインドの伝流研序説, in *Zenbunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 禅文化研究所紀要 6. Reprinted in Nishi 1975: 351-74.
- . 1975. *Abidatsuma Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 阿毘達磨仏教の研究 (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会).
- Nishimura Minori 西村実則. 1974. "Daishubu, Setsushussebu ni okeru yōgācyāra" 大衆部・説出世部におけるヨーガーチャラ. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 32 / 2: 915-18.
- Nishioka Soshū 西岡祖秀. 1980, 1981, 1983. "'Putun Bukkyō-shi' Mokurokubu Sakuin I, II & III" 「ブトゥン仏教史」目録部索引 [An Index to the Catalogue Portion of Bu ston's History of Buddhism]. *Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Bunka Kōryū Kenkyū Shisetsu Kenkyū Kiyō* 東京大学文学部文化交流研究施設研究紀要 4: 61-92, 5: 43-94, 6: 47-201.

- Njamasch, Marlene. 1970. "Hierarchische Strukturen in den buddhistischen Klöstern Indiens in der ersten Hälfte des ersten Jahrtausends unserer Zeitrechnung." *Ethnographisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift* 11: 515-39.
- . 1974. "Der *navakammika* und seine Stellung in der Hierarchie der buddhistischen Klöster." *Altorientalische Forschungen* 1: 279-93.
- Nobel, Julius Adolf Johannes. 1937. *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz).
- . 1944. *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. Die tibetischen Übersetzung mit einem Wörterbuch*, vol. 1 (Leiden: E. J. Brill).
- Nolot, Édith. 1991. *Règles de Discipline des Nonnes Bouddhistes*. Collège de France, Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne 60 (Paris: Collège de France).
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1969. *The Elders' Verses I: Theragāthā*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 38 (London: Pali Text Society. Reprint 1990).
- . 1971. *The Elders' Verses II: Therīgāthā*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 40 (London: Pali Text Society. Reprint 1991).
- . 1990. "Why are the Four Noble Truths called 'Noble'?" In Y. Karunadasa, ed. *Ānanda: essays in honour of Ananda W.P. Guruge* (Colombo: pages 11-13; Reprinted in Norman 1993: 171-74).
- . 1992. *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta). Volume II: Revised Translation with Introduction and Notes*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 45 (Oxford: The Pali Text Society).
- . 1993. *Collected Papers: Volume IV* (Oxford: The Pali Text Society).
- Ñyāṇamoli [sic], Bhikkhu. 1956, 1964. *The Path of Purification (Vissudhimagga)* (Sri Lanka; Reprint: Berkeley and London: Shambala, 1976). Two volumes.
- Obermiller, Eugene [Evgenni Eugen'evich]. 1932. *History of Buddhism (Chos ḥbyung) by Bu-ston: II. Part: The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*, Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus 19 (Heidelberg; Reprint, Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1964).
- Obeyesekere, Gananath. 1991. "Myth, History and Numerology in the Buddhist Chronicles." In Heinz Bechert ed., *The Dating of the Historical Buddha / Die Datierung des historischen Buddha Part 1* (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, IV, 1). Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 189 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 152-82.
- Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典. 1991. *The Manuscripts of Nanatsudera: A Recently Discovered Treasure-House in Downtown Nagoya*. Italian School of East Asian

Studies Occasional Papers 3 (Kyoto: Istituto Italiano di Cultura, Scuola di Studi sull'Asia Orientale).

- . 1992. "Gatsubashuna-yaku Kashōkyō ni kanserareta Kyōjo no Yukue" 月婆首那訳迦葉經に冠せられた經序の行方 [Tracing the preface appended to the *Jiashe-jing* translated by Upasūnya]. *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū* 佛教史學研究 35 / 2: 61-77.
- Ōda Tokunō 織田得能. 1917. *Bukkyō Daijiten* 佛教大辭典 (New Corrected Edition: Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大藏出版, 1974).
- O'Flaherty, Wendy Doniger. See Wendy Doniger.
- Ogasawara Senshū 小笠原宣秀. "Daizōkyō no Seiritsu to Kaihan" 大藏經の成立と開版. In Yūki Reimon 結城令聞 ed., *Kōza Bukkyō 4: Chūgoku no Bukkyō* 講座佛教・第IV巻・中国の佛教 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大藏出版): 205-24.
- Ogawa Kan'ichi 小川貫一. 1958a. "Fukushū Sūnei Manju Daizō no Chōzō" 福州崇寧萬壽大藏の雕造. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 6 / 2: 518-23.
- . 1958b. "Fukushū Biru Daizōkyō no Chōin" 福州毘盧大藏經の雕印 [The publication of the Vairocana Tripiṭaka in Fuzhou during the Song dynasty]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 7 / 1: 274-77.
- Oikawa Shinkai 及川真介. 1987. "Daikashō (Mahākassapa)" 大迦葉 (Mahākassapa). *Hokke Bunka Kenkyū* 法華文化研究 13: 1-24.
- Okabe, Kazuo. 1980. "The Chinese Catalogues of Buddhist Scriptures." *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 駒沢大学仏教学部研究紀要 38: 1-13.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1886. *Sāṅkhyāyana Grhyasūtra*. Sacred Books of the East 29 (London: Oxford University Press. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1962).
- . 1879-1883. *The Vinaya Piṭakam: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language* (Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1984). 5 volumes.
- , and Richard Pischel. 1883. *The Thera- and Therī-gāthā: (Stanzas Ascribed to Elders of the Buddhist Order of Recluses)* (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1990).
- Olivelle, Patrick. 1976, 1977. *Vāsudevāśrama Yatidharmaprakāśa: A Treatise on World Renunciation*. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library 3, 4 (Vienna: De Nobili Research Library). 2 volumes.
- . 1984. "Renouncer and Renunciation in the *Dharmaśāstras*." In Richard W. Lariviere, ed., *Studies in Dharmaśāstra* (Calcutta: Firma KLM Private Limited): 81-152.

- . 1990. "Villiage vs. Wilderness: Ascetic Ideals and the Hindu World." In Austin B. Creel and Vasudha Narayanan, eds. *Monastic Life in the Christian and Hindu Traditions*. Studies in Comparative Religion 3 (Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press): 125-60.
- Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙. 1932-35. *Bussho Kaisetsu Daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典. (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha 大東出版社). The main text is included in volumes 1-11; 12 and 13 are supplements, published in 1975 and 1977 by Maruyama Takao 丸山孝雄. An original additional volume 別巻, *Bukkyō Kyōten Sōron* 佛教經典総論, "General Study of Buddhist Canonical Literature," is added (sometimes quoted as volume 12 in older scholarship).
- Ōno Hōdō 大野法道. 1933. "Shōjōritsu toshite toriatsukawaretaru Daijō kaikyō: Kashōgonkaikyō, Shaminikaikyō, Daiaidōbikunikyō" 小乗律として取扱われた大乘戒經—迦葉禁戒經・沙彌尼戒經・大愛道比丘尼經—. In Kishi Kakuyū 岸覚勇 ed., *Imaoka kyōju kanreki kinen ronbunshū (Jōdogaku 5-6)* 今岡教授還暦記念論文集 (淨土学五・六) (Tokyo: Taishō Daigaku Jōdogaku Kenkyūkai 大正大學淨土學研究會): 386-99.
- . 1935. "Kashōgonkaikyō no kenkyū" 迦葉禁戒經の研究. In Bukkyō Nisengohyakunen Kinengakkai 佛教二千五百年記念學會 ed., *Bukkyōgaku no Shomondai* 佛教學の諸問題 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店): 567-80.
- . 1954. *Daijō Kaikyō no Kenkyū* 大乘戒經の研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房佛書林).
- Ōshika Jisshu 大鹿實秋. 1970. "Chibetto-bun Yuimakyō Tekisuto" チベット文維摩經テキスト. *Acta Indologica / Indo Koten Kenkyū* インド古典研究 I: 139-240.
- Overmyer, Daniel L. 1976. *Folk Buddhist Religion: Dissenting Sects in Late Traditional China* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Pachow, W. and Ramakanta Mishra. 1956. *The Prātimokṣa-sūtra of the Mahāsāṅghikās* (Allahabad: Ganganatha Jha Research Institute).
- Paik, Nak Choon. 1951. "Tripitaka Koreana." *Transactions of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 32: 62-73.
- Pāṇḍeya, Umeśa Chandra. 1969. *The Āpastamba-Dharma-sūtra: With the 'Ujjvalā' Commentary of Śrī Haradatta Miśra*. Kashi Sanskrit Series 93. Second edition (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office).
- Pāsādika, Bhikkhu. 1989. *Nāgārjuna's Sūtrasamuccaya: A Critical Edition of the Mdo kun las btus pa*. Fontes Tibetici Havnienses 2 (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag).
- Pedersen, K. Priscilla. 1980. "Notes on the Ratnakūṭa Collection." *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 3 / 2: 60-66.

- Pelliot, Paul. 1936. Review of Staël-Holstein 1926 and 1933, and Weller 1933. *T'oung-pao* 32: 68-76.
- . 1953. *Les débuts de l'imprimerie en Chine*. Oeuvres Posthumes de Paul Pelliot 4 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale / Adrien Maisonneuve).
- Peri, Noël. 1911. Review of Matsumoto Bunzaburō 1911. *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 11: 439-58.
- Pischel, Richard. 1981. *A Grammar of the Prākṛit Languages*. Trans. Subhadra Jhā (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass). The German original is 1900.
- Pradhan, Prahlad. 1950. *Abhidharma Samuccaya of Asanga*. Visva-Bharati Studies 12 (Santiniketan: Visva-Bharati).
- . 1975. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*, Tibetan Sanskrit Works 8 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Prasad, Maulichand. 1984. *A Comparative Study of Abhisamācārikā*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 26 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Prasad, Nand Kishore. 1972. *Studies in Buddhist and Jaina Monachism*. Prakrit Jaina Institute Research Publication Series 9 (Vaishali: Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology & Ahimsa).
- Przyluski, Jean. 1914. "Le Nord-ouest de l'Inde dans le Vinaya des Mūla-sarvāstivādin et les textes apparetés." *Journal Asiatique* 11th series, tome 4: 493-568.
- . 1918-20. "Le Parinirvāṇa et les Funérailles du Buddha." *Journal Asiatique* series 11, 11: 485-526; 12: 401-56; 13: 365-430; 15: 5-54 (Reprinted: Paris: Imprimerie Nationale / Paul Geuthner, 1920).
- . 1923. *La Légende de l'Empereur Aśoka (Aśoka-avadāna) dans les textes Indiens et Chinois*. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études, tome 31 (Paris: Paul Geuthner).
- . 1926-28. *Le Council de Rājagṛha: Introduction à l'Histoire des Canons et des Sectes Bouddhiques*. Buddhica Première série: Mémoires, tome 2 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner).
- . 1929. "La Croyance au Messie dans l'Inde et l'Iran." *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 100: 1-12.
- Rahder, Johannes. 1926. *Daśabhūmikasūtra et Bodhisattvabhūmi: Chapitres Vihāra et Bhūmi* (Paris: Paul Geuthner).
- , and Shinryu Susa. 1931-32. "The Gāthās of the Daśabhūmika-sūtra." *The Eastern Buddhist* V / 4: 335-59, VI / 1: 51-84.

- Rahula, Walpola. 1956. *History of Buddhism in Ceylon: The Anurādhapura Period: 3rd Century BC — 10th Century AC* [sic] (Colombo: M.D. Gunasena & Co.).
- . 1980. *Le Compendium de la Super-Doctrine (Philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asaṅga*. Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient 78 (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient).
- Ratnachandrajī. 1923-32. *An Illustrated Ardha-Magadhi Dictionary* (Indore; Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988). 5 volumes.
- Régamey, Konstanty. 1938a. *The Bhadramāyākāravāyākaraṇa: Introduction, Tibetan Text, Translation and Notes*. The Warsaw Society of Sciences and Letters, Publications of the Oriental Commission Nr. 3 (Warsaw: Nakładem Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego Wydano z Zasiłku Funduszu Kultury J. Piłsudskiego).
- . 1938b. *Three Chapters from the Samādhirājasūtra*. The Warsaw Society of Sciences and Letters. Publications of the Oriental Commission Nr. 1 (Warsaw: Nakładem Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego Wydane Zasiłkiem Kasy Im. Mianowskiego).
- Renou, Louis. 1975. *Grammaire Sanscrite*. Second corrected edition (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve).
- Rhys Davids, Thomas William. 1890, 1894. *The Questions of King Milinda*. The Sacred Books of the East 35, 36 (Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprint: New York: Dover Publications, 1963). 2 volumes.
- . 1908. "Sects (Buddhist)." In James Hastings, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons): 11.307-09.
- , and Joseph Estlin Carpenter. 1890-1911. *The Dīgha Nikāya* (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1975). 3 volumes.
- , and Caroline Augusta Foley Rhys Davids. 1899-1921. *Dialogues of the Buddha*. Sacred Books of the Buddhists (London: Pali Text Society. Reprint, 1977). 3 volumes.
- , and William Stede. 1921-25. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary* (Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1979).
- Robinson, Richard. 1965-66. "The Ethic of the Householder Bodhisattva." *Bhāratī: Bulletin of the College of Indology* 9 / 2: 25-56
- Roth, Gustav. 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Manual of Discipline for Buddhist Nuns*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 12 (Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute).

- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1974. "Pāli *gotta* / *gotra* and the term *gotrabhū* in Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit." In Lance Cousins et al. eds., *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel): 199-210.
- Sadakata Akira 定方晟. 1981. "Miuro to Miroku" ミイロと弥勒. *Tōkai Daigaku Kiyō Bungakubu* 東海大学紀要文学部 35: 45-54.
- Saeki Kyokuga 佐伯旭雅. 1887. *Kandō Abidatsuma Kusharon* 冠導阿毘達磨俱舍論 (Photo reprint of woodblock edition: Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館, 1978). 3 volumes (continuous pagination).
- Saitō Kōjun 斎藤光純. 1977. "Kawaguchi Ekai-shi Shōrai Tōyō Bunko Shozō Shōhon Chibetto Daizōkyō Chōsa Bibō," 河川慧海師将来東洋文庫所蔵写本チベット大藏經調査忘 [A Study of the Manuscript Kanjur kept in the Tōyō Bunko] *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 63: 1-62.
- Sakaino Kōyō 境野黄洋. 1935. *Shina Bukkyō Seishi* 支那佛教精史 (Tokyo: Sakaino Kōyō Hakase Ikō Kankōkai 境野黄洋博士遺稿刊行會).
- Sakaki Ryōsaburō 榊亮三郎. 1916. *Mahāvvyutpatti* (Kyoto: Kyōto Teikoku Daigaku Bunka Daigaku Sōsho 京都帝國大學文科大學叢書 3. Numerous reprints.)
- Sakurabe, Bunkyo 桜部文鏡. 1930. "Chibettoyaku Daihōshakukyō no kenkyū" 西藏譯大寶積經の研究. *Ōtani Gakuhō* 大谷學報 11 / 3: 134-75.
- . 1930-32. *A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Kanjur Division of the Tibetan Tripitaka / Ōtani Daigaku Toshokan Zō: Chibetto Daizōkyō Kanjūru Kandō Mokuroku*, 大谷大學図書館蔵・西藏大藏經甘珠爾勘同目錄 3 vols. (Kyoto: Ōtani Daigaku Toshokan 大谷大學圖書館).
- Sakurabe Hajime 桜部建. 1965. "Miroku to Aitta" 弥勒と阿逸多 [Maitreya and Ajita]. *Bukkyōgaku Seminā* 佛教學セミナー 2: 34-44.
- . 1980. "On the *Wu-t'ing-hsin-kuan*." In *Indianisme et Bouddhisme: Mélanges offerts à Mgr Étienne Lamotte*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 23 (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste): 307-12.
- Sakuma, Hidenori S. 1990. *Die Āsrayaparivṛtti-Theorie in der Yogācārabhūmi*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 40 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner). 2 volumes.
- Samtani, N. H. 1971. *The Arthaviniścaya-sūtra & Its Commentary (Nibandhana)*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 13 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Samten, Jampa. 1992. "Preliminary Notes on the Phug-brag bKa'-'gyur: A Unique Edition of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon." In Shōren Ihara and Zuihō Yamaguchi, eds. *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies Narita 1989*. Monograph Series (Occasional Papers 2). Volume 1: Buddhist Philosophy and Literature (Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji): 115-20.

- Sander, Lore. 1968. *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung*. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 8 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).
- . 1985. “*Paṛiṣad* und *paṛṣad* in Vinaya- und Hinayāna-Sūtra-Texten aus den Turfanfunden und aus Gilgit.” In Heinz Bechert, ed. *Zu Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hinayāna-Literatur I*. (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III,1). Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 149 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 144-60.
- . 1991. “The earliest manuscripts from Central Asia and the Sarvāstivāda mission.” *Corolla Iranica: Papers in honour of Prof. Dr. David Neil MacKenzie on the occasion of his 65th birthday on April 8th, 1991*. Ronald E. Emmerick and Dieter Weber, eds. (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang): 133-50.
- Sankrityayana, Rahula. 1981. *Vinayasūtra of Bhadanta Gunaprabha*. Singhi Jain Śāstra Śikṣāpīṭha [sic] Singhi Jain Series 74 (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan).
- Sasaki Kōken 佐々木孝憲. 1965. “Shikushyā Samuccyaya to Sūtra Samuccyaya no Kankei ni tsuite” シクシャー・サムツチャヤとスートラ・サムツチャヤの関係について [On the Relationship between the Śikṣāsamuccaya and the Sūtrasamuccaya]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 14 / 1: 180-83.
- Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑. 1991. “Biku to Gigaku” 比丘と伎楽 [Monastic worship of stūpas with music and dance in Vinaya texts]. *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū* 佛教史學研究 34 / 1: 1-24.
- . 1992. “Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (2) —*Samghabheda* (1) —.” *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 21: 157-76.
- . 1993. “Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (3) —*Samghabheda* (2) —.” *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 22: 167-99.
- Sastri, N. Aiyaswami. 1975, 1978. *Satyasiddhiśāstra of Harivarman*. Volume 1: Sanskrit Text. Volume 2: English Translation. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 159, 165 (Baroda: Oriental Institute).
- Satō Mitsuo 佐藤密雄. 1963. *Genshi Bukkyō Kyōdan no Kenkyū* 原始仏教教團の研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō 山喜房).
- Schlingloff, Dieter. 1964. *Ein Buddhistisches Yogalehrbuch*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 7 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
- Schmidt, Richard. 1928. *Nachträge zum Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in Kürzer Fassung von Otto Böhtlingk* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz. Reprint: Tokyo: Meicho-Fukuyukai, 1983).

- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1991. *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 6 (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies).
- Schopen, Gregory. 1977. "Sukhāvati as a Generalized Religious Goal in Sanskrit Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 19: 177-210.
- . 1978. "The Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra and the Buddhism of Gilgit." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Australian National University.
- . 1979. "Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 21: 1-19.
- . 1985. "Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman / Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10: 9-47.
- . 1989a. "The Stūpa Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 13: 83-100.
- . 1989b. "The Manuscript of the Vajracchedikā Found at Gilgit." Luis O. Gómez and Jonathan A. Silk, eds. *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts*. Michigan Studies in Buddhist Literature 1 (Ann Arbor: Collegiate Institute for the Study of Buddhist Literature and Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan): 89-139.
- . 1990. "The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 18: 181-217.
- . 1991. "Monks and the Relic Cult in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*: An Old Misunderstanding in Regard to Monastic Buddhism." In Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen, eds., *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-hua* (Oakville, Canada: Moasic Press): 187-201.
- . 1992. "On Avoiding Ghosts and Social Censure: Monastic Funerals in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20: 1-39.
- . 1994. "Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 22: 31-80.
- . Forthcoming. "The Monastic Ownership of Servants and Slaves: Local and Legal Factors in the Redactional History of Two Vinayas." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 17 / 2.
- Schrader, Friedrich Otto. 1912. *The Minor Upaniṣads. Volume 1: Saṃnyāsa-Upaniṣads*. Adyar Library Series 3 (Madras: The Adyar Library).

- Schubring, Walther. 1905. *Das Kalpa-sūtra: Die alte Sammlung jainistischer Mönchsvorschriften*. Indica 2 (Leipzig; Reprinted in Schubring 1977: 1-69).
- . 1910. "The Kalpasūtra. An Old Collection of Disciplinary Rules for Jaina Monks." Trans. May S. Burgess. *Indian Antiquary* 39: 257-67.
- . 1966. *Drei Chedasūtras des Jaina-Kanons: Āyāradasāo, Vavahāra, Nisīha*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 11 (Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter & Co.).
- . 1977. *Walther Schubring Kleine Schriften*. Klaus Bruhn, ed. Glasenapp-Stiftung 13 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).
- Schuster, Nancy J. 1976. "The *Ugrapariprocchā*, the *Mahāratnakūta* and Early Mahāyāna Buddhism." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto. 2 volumes.
- . 1985. "The *Bodhisattva* Figure in the *Ugrapariprocchā*." In Anthony K. Warder, ed., *New Paths in Buddhist Research* (Durham, North Carolina: The Acorn Press): 26-56.
- Senart, Émile Charles Marie. 1882-97. *Le Mahāvastu*, Société Asiatique, Collection d'Ouvrages Orientaux, Seconde Série (Paris: Imprimerie National; Reprint Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, 1977). 3 volumes.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. 1954. Review of Ensink 1952. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1954 / 1-2: 79-82.
- Shastri, Swami Dwarikadas, 1971. *Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Acharya Vasubandhu with Sphuṭārthā Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra*, Bauddha Bharati Series 6 (Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati).
- Sheth, Harigovind Das Trikam Chand. 1928. *Pāia-Sadda-Mahaṇṇavo* (Calcutta; Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986).
- Shih, Heng-ching. 1991. *The Sūtra on Upāsaka Precepts* (Tokyo & Berkeley: Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai).
- Shimizu Masumi 清水真澄. 1978. "Miroku to sono katachi" 弥勒とその形 [Maitreya and his form]. *Daihōrin* 大法輪 45 / 2: 166-73.
- Shimoda Masahiro 下田正弘. 1987. "Daishūbukei Shamikai no tekisuto ni tsuite" 大衆部系沙弥戒のテキストについて [A Note on the *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 35 / 2: 941-39 (sic).
- . 1991. "'Genshi Nehangyō' no sonzai: 'Daijō Nehangyō' no seiritsushiteki kenkyū — sono ichi" 『原始涅槃經』の存在・『大乗涅槃經』の成立史的研究 その1 [The Urtext of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*]. *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要 103: 1-126.

- . 1993. *Zōbun Wayaku "Daijō Nehangyō" (I)* 藏文和訳『大乘涅槃經』(I): *An Annotated Japanese Translation of the Tibetan Version of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra (I)*. Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 4 (Tokyo: The Sankibo Press).
- . 1994. "The Relationship between the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and the *Mahāsāṅghika*." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 42 / 2: 1061-1056 (sic).
- Shio Benkyō 椎尾辨匡. 1931. *Bukkyō Kyōten Gaisetsu* 佛教經典概説 (Reprint: Tokyo: Sankō Bunka Kenkyūjo 三康文化研究所, 1971).
- Shiraishi Shindō 白石眞道. 1957. "Mahāvastu, Heft II." *Yamanashi Daigaku Geigakubu Kiyō* 山梨大學藝学部紀要 / *Proceedings of the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Education, Yamanashi University* 2: 1-133. Reprinted in Shiraishi 1988: 79-208. It is stated: "übersetzt von Prof. Dr. Ernst Leumann ... in Verbindung mit Shindō Shiraishi."
- . 1988. *Shiraishi Shindō Bukkyōgaku Ronbunshū* 白石眞道・仏教学論文集 [The Collected Papers of Shiraishi Shindō]. Shiraishi Hisako 白石寿子 (ed.) (Sagamihara-shi, Japan: Kyōbi shuppansha 京美出版社).
- Shizutani Masao 静谷正雄. 1957. "Shoki no Daijōkyōdan ni tsuite" 初期の大乗教団について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 5 / 2: 429-37.
- . 1974. *Shoki Daijō Bukkyō no Seiritsu Katei* 初期大乘仏教の成立過程 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑).
- Shukla, Karunesha. 1973. *Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 14 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Silk, Jonathan. 1989. "A Note on the Opening Formula of Buddhist Sūtras." *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 12 / 1: 158-63.
- . 1994. *The Heart Sutra in Tibetan: A Critical Edition of the Two Recensions Contained in the Kanjur*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismus Kunde 28 (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien).
- Singh, Sanghasen. 1983. *A Study of the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha-ṭīkā*. Second Edition. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 24 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).
- Skilling, Peter. 1991. Review of Harrison 1990. *Journal of the Siam Society* 79 / 2: 152-6.
- Skorupski, Tadeusz. 1985. *A Catalogue of the sTog Palace Kanjur*, Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series maior IV (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies).

- Smith, Helmer. 1915. *The Khuddaka-pāṭha, together with its Commentary Paramatthajotikā I* (Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1959).
- . 1917. *Sutta-Nipāta Commentary II, being Paramatthajotikā II,2* (Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1966).
- Smith, Brian K. 1987. "Exorcising the Transcendent: Strategies for Defining Hinduism and Religion." *History of Religions* 27 / 1: 32-55.
- Soymié, Michel. 1983. *Catalogue des Manuscrits chinois de Touen-houang: Fonds Pelliot chinois de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Volume 3 (Paris: Éditions de la Fondation Singer-Polignac).
- Speyer, Jacob Samuel. 1886. *Sanskrit Syntax* (Leiden. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988).
- . 1895. *The Gātakamālā or Garland of Birth-Stories by Āryaśūra*. Sacred Books of the Buddhists 1 (London: Oxford University Press).
- . 1906-09. *Avadānaśataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*, Bibliotheca Buddhica 3, Indo-Iranian Reprints 3 (St. Petersburg; Reprint: The Hauge: Mouton, 1958). 2 volumes.
- Sponberg, Alan and Helen Hardacre, eds. 1988. *Maitreya, the Future Buddha* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Sprockhoff, Joachim Friedrich. 1981, 1984. "Āraṇyaka und Vānaprastha in der Vedischen Literatur: Neue Erwägungen zu einer alten Legende und ihren Problemen." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 25: 19-90; 28: 5-43.
- Stache-Rosen, Valentina. 1984. *Upālipariprocchāsūtra: Ein Text zur buddhistischen Ordensdisziplin*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, 140 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander Wilhelm, Baron von. 1926. *The Kāṣyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class: Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese* (Shanghai: Commercial Press).
- . 1933. *A Commentary to the Kāṣyapaparivarta: Edited in Tibetan and Chinese* (Peking: The National Library of Peking and the National Tsinghua University).
- Stein, Otto. 1936. "The Numeral 18." *The Poona Orientalist* 1 / 3: 1-37. Reprinted in Stein 1985: 515-51.
- . 1937. "Additional Notes on the Numeral 18." *The Poona Orientalist* 2: 164-65. Reprinted in Stein 1985: 552-53.

- . 1985. *Otto Stein Kleine Schriften*. Friedrich Wilhelm, ed. Glasenapp-Stiftung 25 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag).
- Steinthal, Paul. 1885. *Udāna* (London: Pali Text Society. Reprint 1982).
- Strenski, Ivan. 1983. "On Generalized Exchange and the Domestication of the *Sangha*." *Man* 18: 463-77.
- Strong, John. 1983. *The Legend of King Aśoka: A Study and Translation of the Aśokāvadāna* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Sugimoto Takushū 杉本卓洲. 1991. "Bosatsu no Gogi" 菩薩の語義 [Various Meanings of Bodhisattva (Bodhisatta)]. In Maeda Egaku Hakase Shōju Kinenkai 前田惠学博士頌寿記念会, eds., *Maeda Egaku Hakase Shōju Kinen: Bukkyō Bunka Gakuronshū* 前田惠学博士頌寿記念・仏教文化学論集 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房仏書林): 275-88 (506-493).
- Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro, and Hokei Idzumi. 1949. *The Gandavyuha Sutra* (Kyoto: The Society for the Publication of Sacred Books of the World. Originally published 1934).
- Takakusu, Junjirō. 1896. *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in Indian and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695) by I-Tsing*. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).
- , and Makoto Nagai. 1927. *Samāniapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka*. Volume 2 (Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1969).
- Takasaki, Jikido 高崎直道. 1965. *Tōkyō Daigaku Shozō: Rasaban Chibetto Daizōkyō Mokuroku* 東京大学所蔵ラサ版チベット大蔵経目録 [A Catalogue of the Lhasa Kanjur kept in Tokyo University Library] (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Indotetsugaku Indobungaku kenkyūshitsu 東京大学文学部印度哲学印度文学研究室).
- . 1966. *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra): Being a Treatise on the Tathāgarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism*. Serie Oriental Roma 33 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).
- . 1974. *Nyoraizō Shisō no Keisei: Indo Daijō Bukkyō Shisō Kenkyū* 如來藏思想の形成・インド大乘仏教思想研究 [Formation of the Tathāgatagarbha Theory] (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- Takata Osamu 高田修. 1971. *Ajyanta: Sekkutsu Jiin to Hekiga* アジャンタ・石窟寺院と壁画 (Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社).
- Tanemura, Ryūgen. 1993. "The Four *Nikāyas* Mentioned in the *Gandilakṣaṇa* Chapter of the *Kriyāsamgraha*." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 41 / 2: 1123-21 (sic).

- Tatia, Nathmal. 1975. *Prātimokṣasūtram*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 16 (Patna: Kasahi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).
- . 1983. "Parallel Developments in the Meaning of Parijñā (Prakrit Parinnā, Pāli Pariññā) in the Canonical Literature of the Jainas and the Buddhists." *Indologica Taurinensia* 11: 293-302.
- Tatsuyama Shōshin 龍山章眞. 1938. *Bonbun Wayaku Jūjikyō* 梵文和譯十地經 (Reprint: Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会, 1982).
- Tatz, Mark. 1986. *Asanga's Chapter on Ethics With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa, The Basic Path to Awakening, The Complete Bodhisattva*. Studies in Asian Thought and Religion 4 (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press).
- Tauscher, Helmut. 1994. "Tanjur Fragments from the Manuscript Collection at Ta pho Monastery: *Sambandhaparīkṣā* with Its Commentaries *Vṛtti* and *Ṭikā*." *East and West* 44 / 1: 173-84.
- Tenzin, Chatring Jansar. 1972. *The Collected Works of Cha-har Dge-bshes Blo-bzang-tshul Khrims: Reproduced from a set of xylographic prints from the Peking blocks*. Volume 4 (New Delhi: No publisher given).
- Teramoto Enga 寺本婉雅 and Hiramatsu Tomotsugu 平松友嗣. 1935. *Zōkanwa sanyaku taikō Ibushūrinron, Ibushūseishaku, Ibusesshū* 藏漢和三譯對校・異部宗輪論・異部宗精釋・異部說集. (Kyoto: Mokudōsha 默働社).
- Thakkur, Kanaklāl. 1987. *Kumārasambhavam-Mahākāvyaṃ of Mahākavi Kālidāsa with Sañjivini and Śisuhitaiṣiṇī Commentaries by Mallinātha and Sītārām Kavi*. Kashi Sanskrit Series 14 (Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan).
- Thapar, Romila. 1976. "Dāna and Dakṣiṇā as forms of Exchange." *Indica* 13 / 1-2: 37-48. Reprinted in: *Ancient Indian Social History: Some Interpretations* (New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1978): 105-21.
- Toda, Hirofumi. 1981. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra: Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text* (Tokushima: Kyoiku Shuppan Center).
- Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定. 1938. *Gokan yori Sōsei ni itaru Yakkyō Sōroku* 後漢より宋齊に至る訳経総録 (Reprint: Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会, 1973).
- Tokiwai, Tsurumatsu. 1898. *Studien zum Sumāgadhāvadāna* (Darmstadt: G. Otto's Hof-Buchdruckerei).
- Tokiya Yukinori 釋舎幸紀. 1979. "Miroku seigan wayaku" 弥勒誓願和訳 [A Japanese translation of the Vows of Maitreya]. *Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 佛教學研究 35: 1-27.
- Tomomatsu Entai 友松圓諦. 1920. "Indo sōdan no shokushō ni tsuite" 印度僧團の職掌について [The Offices of Indian Buddhist Monasteries]. *Mugekō* 無礙光 June # 3: 7-14 and July # 4: 16-20.

- . 1931. "Sūtrālamkāra et Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā." *Journal Asiatique* 219: 135-74, 245-337. Reprinted in Tomomatsu 1970.
- . 1932. *Bukkyō Keizai Shisō Kenkyū: Indo kodai bukkyō jīn shoyū ni kansuru gakusetsu* 佛教經濟思想研究・印度古代佛教寺院所有に関する學說 [A Study of Buddhist Economic Thought: A Theory Concerning the Possessions of Buddhist Monasteries in Ancient India] (Tokyo: Tōhō shoin 東方書院).
- . 1965. *Bukkyō ni okeru Bunpai no Riron to Jissai (jō): Bukkyō keizai shisō kenkyū (2)* 佛教に於ける分配の理論と實際 (上)・佛教經濟思想研究 (2) [The Theory and Practice of Distribution in Buddhism]. (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- . 1970. *Bukkyō ni okeru Bunpai no Riron to Jissai (chū): Bukkyō keizai shisō kenkyū (3)* 佛教に於ける分配の理論と實際 (中)・佛教經濟思想研究 (3). (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- . 1972. "Mujinzai to Buha" 無尽財と部派 [The Inexhaustible Gift and Sectarian Buddhism]. In Satō Mitsuo Hakase Koki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 佐藤密雄博士古希記念論文集刊行会 ed., *Satō Hakase Koki Kinen: Bukkyō Shisō Ronsō* 佐藤博士古希記念・佛教思想論叢 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林): 191-200.
- Trenckner, Vilhelm. 1880. *The Milindapañho: Being Dialogues between King Milinda and the Buddhist Sage Nāgasena* (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1986).
- , and Robert Chalmers. 1888-96. *The Majjhima-Nikāya* (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1977-79).
- , et al. 1924-. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy).
- Tsien, Tsuen-hsuin. 1985. *Science and Civilization in China: Chemistry and Chemical Technology: Paper and Printing*. Volume 5, part 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Tsuburaya Akio 円谷彰孝. 1978. "Shoki Daijō ni okeru Jukai ni tsuite" 初期大乘における受戒について [On Taking the Precepts in Early Mahāyāna]. *Chūō Gakujutsu Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 中央學術研究所紀要 7: 105-15.
- Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆. 1975. *Chūgoku Kinse Bukkyōshi no Shomondai* 中国近世仏教史の諸問題. Tsukamoto Zenryū Chosakushū 5 塚本善隆著作集第五卷 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppan 大東出版).
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆. 1913. "Daihōshakukyō' Gairon" 「大寶積經」概論 [An Outline of the *Mahāratnakūṭa*]. *Rokujō Gakuhō* 六條學報 135: 25-44; 136: 15-28; 139: 27-43; 140: 30-49; 141: 17-26; 142: 16-28.

- . 1934. "Daihōshakushōbōkyō no ketsubun ni tsuite" 大寶積正法經の缺文に就て [On Missing Text in the Song Dynasty Chinese translation of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*]. *Seizan gakuho* 西山学報 7: 64-73. Reprinted in Tsukinowa 1971: 356-63.
- . 1935. "Kohon 'Daihōshakukyō' ni tsuite" 古品「大寶積經」に就て [On the Old *Kāśyapaparivarta*]. In Bukkyō Nisengohyakunen Kinen Gakkai 佛教二千五百年記念學會 ed., *Bukkyōgaku no Shomondai* 佛教學の諸問題 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店): 849-65. Reprinted in Tsukinowa 1971: 393-407.
- . 1971. *Butten no Hihanteki Kenkyū* 仏典の批判的研究 [A Critical Study of Buddhist Scriptures] (Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑).
- Tucci, Giuseppe. 1958. *Minor Buddhist Texts II*. Serie orientale Roma 9 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).
- . 1980. *The Religions of Tibet* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).
- Ui Hakuju, et al. 宇井伯壽. 1934. *Chibetto Daizōkyō Sōmoku-roku / A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Canons (Bkaḥ-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur)* 西藏大藏經總目錄 (Sendai: Tohoku Imperial University).
- Ujike Kakushō 氏家覺勝. 1985. "Bukkyō kyōten ni okeru sendara no yōrei (oboegaki)" 仏教經典における旃陀羅の用例(覚え書) [A Note on *caṇḍāla* in the Buddhist Canons]. *Kōyasan Daigaku Ronsō* 高野山大学論叢 20: 1-21.
- Upādhyāya, Āchārya Baladeva. 1966. *Agnipurāṇa of Mahārṣi Vedavyāsa*. Kashi Sanskrit Series 174 (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office).
- Upasak, C. S. 1975. *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms (Based on Pali Literature)* (Varanasi: Bharati Prakashan).
- Vadekar, R. D. 1939. *Pātimokkha*. Bhandarkar Oriental Series 1 (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute).
- van der Leeuw, Gerardus. 1938. *Religion in Essence and Manifestation* (Reprint: New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963). 2 volumes.
- Vaudechal, Le Commandant. 1914. "Les pierres gravées du Chê King Chān 石經山 et le Yūn Kiū Sséu 雲居寺." *Journal Asiatique* 11th series, volume 3: 375-459.
- Vidyabhusana, Satis Chandra. 1915. "So-sor-thar-pa; or Code of Buddhist Monastic Laws: Being the Tibetan version of Prātimokṣa of the Mūla-sarvāstivāda School." *Journal & Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* ii / 3-4: 29-139.
- Vogel, Jean Phillipe. 1921-22. "Shorkot Inscription of the Year 83." *Epigraphia Indica* XVI: 15-17.

- von Hinüber, Oskar. 1982. "Upāli's Verses in the Majjhimanikāya and the Madhyamāgama." In L. A. Hercus et al., eds. *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies): 243-51.
- . 1983. "Sanskrit und Gāndhārī in Zentralasien." In Klaus Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker, eds. *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien*. Veröffentlichung der Societas Uralo-Altaica 16 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz): 27-34.
- . 1985. "Die Bestimmung der Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Texte nach sprachlichen Kriterien." In Heinz Bechert, ed. *Zu Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur I*. (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III,1). Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 149 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 57-75.
- . 1986. *Das Ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 467 (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- . 1987. "Das buddhistische Recht und die Phonetik des Pāli: Ein Abschnitt aus der Samantapāsādikā über die Vermeidung von Aussprachefehlern in *kammavācās*." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 13 / 14: 101-27.
- . 1989. "Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit." In Colette Caillat, ed. *Dialectes dans les Littératures Indo-Aryennes*. Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne 55 (Paris: Collège de France): 341-67.
- von Simson, Georg. 1965. *Zur Diktion einiger Lehrtexte des Buddhistischen Sanskritkanons*. Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, hrsg. Karl Hoffmann und Helmut Humbach, Beiheft H (Munich: J. Kitzinger).
- . 1986. *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Sanskrittexte aus der Turfanfunden XI. Teil I. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologische-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 155 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1950-51. *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Übersetzung der Chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1949 Nr. 1; Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1950 Nr. 2, Nr. 3 (Berling: Akademie-Verlag). 3 volumes.
- . 1952-62. *Das Catuspariṣatsūtra*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1952 Nr. 2, Jahrgang 1956 Nr. 1, 1960 Nr. 1 (Berling: Akademie-Verlag). 3 volumes.

- , et al. 1973-. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Wang Bangwei 王邦維. 1988. *Datang Xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan xiaozhu* 大唐西域求法高僧傳校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書房).
- Ware, James R. 1938. "The Preamble to the *Samgharakṣitāvadāna*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 3: 47-67.
- Warren, Henry Clark, and Dharmananda Kosambi. 1950. *Vissudhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya*. Harvard Oriental Series 41 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; Reprint: New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989).
- Watanabe, Shoko. 1975. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Manuscripts Found in Gilgit*. Part Two: Romanized Text (Tokyo: The Reiyukai).
- Watson, Burton. 1993. *The Lotus Sutra* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Watters, Thomas. 1904, 1905. *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*. Oriental Translation Fund, New Series 14, 15 (London. Reprint: New York: AMS Press, 1971). 2 volumes.
- Wayman, Alex. 1959. "Studies in Yama and Māra." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 3: 44-73, 112-31.
- . 1961. *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript*. University of California Publications in Classical Philology 17 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).
- Weber, Albrecht Friedrich. 1855. *The Ṣatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (London and Berlin. Reprint: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 96. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1964).
- Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language*. Second Edition (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1959).
- Weckman, George. 1987. "Community." In Mircea Eliade, ed., *Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan Publishing): 3.566-71.
- Weller, Friedrich. 1965. *Zum Kāśyapaparivarta, Heft 2: Verdeutschung des sanskrit-tibetischen Texts*. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig: Phil.-hist. Klasse 57-3 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).
- Wilson, Bryan, and Karel Dobbelare. 1994. *A Time to Chant: The Sōka Gakkai Buddhists in Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲來. 1904. "Bouddhisme. Notes et Bibliographie: Contributions to the study of the Śikṣasamuccaya derived from Chinese sources (1) (Continuation) and (end)," *Le Muséon* (New Series) 5: 96-103, 209-215, 7: 255-61.

- . 1931. *Bonzō Waei Gappeki Jōdo Sambukyō: Jōdoshū Zensho 23* 梵藏和英合璧淨土三部經・淨土宗全書 (Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 1971).
- . 1932-35. *Abhisamayālamkāraḥ Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā*, Tōyō Bunko Publications Series D, 2 (Tokyo: The Tōyō Bunko. Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 1973).
- . 1936. *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of [the] Whole Course of the Bodhisattva (Being [the] Fifteenth Section of [the] Yogācārabhūmi)* (Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibō Buddhist Bookstore, 1971).
- . 1964-74. *Kanyaku Taishō Bonwa Daijiten* 漢訳対照梵和大辞典 (Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation).
- Woodward, Frank Lee. 1916. *Manual of a Mystic: Being a Translation from the Pali and Sinhalese Work Entitled The Yogāvachara's Manual* (London: The Pali Text Society).
- . 1932. *Sāratthappakāsinī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Saṃyutta Nikāya*. Volume 2. Pali Text Society Text Series 119 (Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1977).
- . 1932-36. *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Aṅguttara-Nikāya) or More-Numbered Suttas* (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint 1972-79). 5 volumes.
- . 1959. *Paramattha-Dīpanī Theragāthā-Atthakathā: The Commentary of Dhammapālācariya*. Volume 3 (London: The Pali Text Society).
- , et al. 1956-. *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance* (London: The Pāli Text Society).
- Wu, Kwang-tsing. 1950. "Chinese Printing under Four Alien Dynasties (916 - 1368 A.D.)." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 13: 447-523.
- Xinwenfeng 新文豐 Editorial Committee. 1988. *Songban Jisha Mingban Jiaxing Dazangjing* 宋版磧砂明版嘉興大藏經 (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubun 新文豐出版).
- Yamabe, Nobuyoshi. 1993. "The *Guanfo sanmei hai jing*: A Gandhāran Text or an Apocryphal Chinese Work?" Unpublished manuscript.
- Yamada, Isshi. 1968. *Karuṇāpundarīka* (London: The School of Oriental and African Studies). 2 volumes.
- Yamada, Meiji, et al. 1984. *The Sutra of Contemplation on the Buddha of Immeasurable Life as Expounded by Sakyamuni Buddha* (Kyoto: Ryūkoku University).
- Yamada Ryūjō 山田龍城. 1955. "Rengemenkyō ni tsuite" 蓮華面經について. In Nagao Gajin 長尾雅人 and Nozawa Jōshō 野澤靜證, eds., *Yamaguchi Hakase*

- Kanreki Kinen: Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Ronsō* 山口博士還暦記念・印度学仏教学論叢 / *Studies in Indology and Buddhology: Presented in Honour of Professor Susumu Yamaguchi on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館): 110-23.
- . 1959. *Daijō Bukkyō Seiritsu Ronjosetsu* 大乘佛教成立論序説 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平樂寺書店).
- Yamaguchi, Susumu. 1934. *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭikā: Exposition Systématique du Yogācāravijñaptivāda*. Tome I — Texte. Suzuki Research Foundation Reprint Series 7 (Nagoya: Librarie Hajinkaku; Reprint: Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1966).
- Yamaguchi Zuihō 山口瑞鳳 et al. 1978. *Sutain Shūshū Chibettogo Bunken Kaidai Mokuroku*, スタイン蒐集チベット語文獻解題目録 / *A Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts Collected by Sir Aurel Stein*. Part 2 (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫).
- Yamazaki Gen'ichi 山崎元一. 1987. *Kodai Indo Shakai no Kenkyū* 古代インド社会の研究 (Tokyo: Tōsui shobō 刀水書房).
- Ye Gongchuo 葉恭綽. 1937. "Lidai zangjing kaolüe" 歷代藏經考略. In Hu Shi 胡適 ed., *Zhang Jusheng xiansheng qishishengri jinian lunwenji* 張菊生先生七十生日紀念論文集 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan 商務印書館): 25-42, plus plates.
- . [Yeh Kung-cho]. 1946. "Chinese editions of Tripitaka." *Philobiblon: A Quarterly Review of Chinese Publications* (Nanking, China: The National Central Library. Reprint: Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus, 1969) 2: 26-29.
- Yoshimura, Shyuki. 1950. *The Denkar-Ma, an Oldest Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons* (Kyoto: Ryukoku University. Reprinted in Yoshimura Shūki 芳村修基 *Indo Daijō Bukkyō Shisō Kenkyū* インド大乘仏教思想研究 [Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑, 1974]: 99-199).
- Yuyama Akira 湯山明. 1989. "Gyakurokayada" 逆路伽耶陀. In Fujita Kōtatsu *Hakushi Kanreki Kinen Ronshū: Indo Tetsugaku to Bukkyō* 藤田宏達 博士還暦記念論集 インド哲学と仏教 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平樂寺書店): 355-72.
- Zachariae, Theodor. 1897. *The Mañkhakośa: Edited together with Extracts from the Commentary, and Three Indices*. Kashi Sanskrit Series 216 (Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1972. Reprint of the second edition of the original which is: *Der Mañkhakośa. Hrsg. mit Auszügen aus dem Commenatare und drei Indices*. Vienna / Bombay, 1897. Part of the series *Quellenwerke der Altindischen Lexikographie* 3).
- Zhonghua Fojiao Xiehui 中国佛教協會. 1978. *Fangshan Yunju-si Shijing* 房山雲居寺石經 (Peking: Xinhua shudian 新華書店).

- Zhou Fagao 周法高. 1962. *Xuanying Yiqiejing Yinyi* 玄應一切經音義 (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo 中央研究院歷史語言研究所)
- Zhulin Jushi 竹林居士. 1988. *Fojiao Nanzi zidian* 佛教難字字典 (Taipei: Changchunshu shufang 常春樹書房).
- Zimmer, Heinrich. 1925. *Karman: Ein buddhistischer Legendkranz* (Munich: F. Bruckmann).
- Zimmermann, Francis. 1987. *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats: An Ecological Theme in Hindu Medicine* (Berkeley: University of California Press; Original French edition 1982).
- Zysk, Kenneth G. 1985. *Religious Healing in the Veda*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 75 / 7 (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society).